DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 406 VT 007 762

Report of the Committee on Administration of Training Programs.
Committee on Administration of Training Programs, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Mar 68
Note-84p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.30
Descriptors-Adult Vocational Education, Apprenticeships, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, *Educational Programs, Federal Legislation, *Federal Programs, Manpower Development, *Program Administration, *Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Welfare Recipients
Identifiers-*Committee On Administration Of Training Programs

The Committee studied the administration of training under federal programs including Manpower Development and Training, Economic Opportunity, Adult Basic Education, Vocational Education, Work-Study Program, Social Security, Vocational Rehabilitation, and National Apprenticeship Training Acts, as well as selected administratively established programs including Five Cities Test Project, Concentrated Employment Programs, and Operation SER. The study extended from April 1967 to March 1968. It was concluded that some waste, duplication, and inefficiency existed in the nearly 30 separate federally supported job training programs but that these failures rarely vitiated the usefulness of the programs. Recommendations include: (1) formulation and codification of national manpower policy, (2) provision for training of individuals receiving welfare benefits without penalization, (3) expansion of apprenticeship and efforts to assist the flow of qualified minority group applicants, (4) assurance that training prepares for entry into jobs with opportunity for advancement and for adequate income, (5) establishment of residential vocational education centers, (6) more adequate funding and arrangement to permit time for programing operations, (7) integration of training activities with the Department of Labor. (JK)

ED027406

R.17

C1

Report of the

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Washington, D.C. 20201
March 1968

VT007762

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Report of the

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Washington, D.C. 20201

March 1968

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Established under Public Law 89-787 pursuant to the request of Congress

April 4, 1968

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I have the honor to submit herewith the report of the Committee on Administration of Training Programs, established by former Secretary Gardner pursuant to Public Law 89-787, Conference Report 2331, Amendment 32, for the purpose of conducting a study of the administration of training programs.

As a part of its study the Committee employed the services of a research contractor, Greenleigh Associates, Inc., New York City. The final report of the contractor is also submitted herewith.

The members of the Committee have appreciated the opportunity to be of service.

Respectfully yours,

Weston E. Vivian

Weston E. Vivian
Chairman

The Secretary
Department of Health, Education,
  and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20201

Chairman, **Weston E. Vivian.** ***Members:*** **John D. Dewhurst, Marvin L. Friedman, Sam S. Grais, Clarence L. Greiber, Joseph A. Kershaw, F. Ray Marshall, J. N. Peet, Mary B. Settle, Eugene J. Taylor, Rev. Louis J. Twomey, S.J., Leonard Woodcock, Stephen J. Wright.**

Staff: **Vernon M. Briggs, Jr.** ***Agency Representatives:*** **Warren T. Roudebush, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Robert Brown, Department of Labor; James L. Robinson, Office of Economic Opportunity.**

Telephone: **202/962-1546**

Mailing address: **Room 5428D**
330 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Dr. Weston E. Vivian, Chairman
President, Electromedia, Inc.
Formerly Representative U. S. Congress
Ann Arbor, Michigan

John D. Dewhurst
President, Arrow Tool Co., Inc., Member, Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, Wethersfield, Connecticut

Marvin L. Friedman
Assistant Director, Research Department, AFL-CIO, Washington, D. C.

Sam S. Grais
President, Gray's Drug Stores and President, Ramsey County Board of Welfare, St. Paul, Minnesota

Clarence L. Greiber
Director, Wisconsin State Board of Vocational and Adult Education, Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. Joseph A. Kershaw
Provost, Williams College, formerly Assistant Director for Research, Plans, Programs, and Evaluation, Office of Economic Opportunity, Williamstown, Massachusetts

Dr. F. Ray Marshall
Professor of Economics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

J. N. Peet
Commissioner, Department of Employment, Salem, Oregon

Mary B. Settle
National Training Director, American National Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Eugene J. Taylor
Adjunct Associate Professor of Rehabilitation Medicine, New York University School of Medicine, New York, New York

Rev. Louis J. Twomey, S. J.
Director, Institute of Human Relations, Loyola University, New Orleans, Louisiana

Leonard Woodcock
International Vice President, United Automobile Workers, Detroit, Michigan

Dr. Stephen J. Wright
President, United Negro College Fund, New York, New York

Former Member

Armando M. Rodriguez

Chief of the Bureau of Intergroup Relations, California Department of Education, Sacramento, California, at the time of appointment. Served as a member of the Committee until June 30, 1967, when he resigned from that position and from the Committee to accept a position with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Observer

Harold Dunne

United Auto Workers, Detroit, Michigan. Participated in Committee sessions as an observer for Mr. Woodcock when labor negotiations in the automobile industry occurred which required Mr. Woodcock's presence.

Staff

Dr. Vernon M. Briggs, Jr.

Research Director (on leave of absence from University of Texas, Austin, Texas)

Grace R. Edwards, Secretary

Joan R. Organ, Secretary

Federal Liaison

William Bonsteel

Budget Examiner, Bureau of the Budget

Robert Brown

Assistant Manpower Administrator, U.S. Department of Labor

James Robinson

Economist, Office of Research, Plans, Programs, and Evaluation, Office of Economic Opportunity

Warren T. Roudebush

Assistant to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Consultants

Greenleigh Associates

(Research Contractor) New York, New York

Dr. Garth Mangum

Co-Director, The Center for Manpower Policy Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Joseph Tuma

Associate in the Division of Manpower Studies, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan and Wayne University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Preface 1

Part I: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Findings. 4
Recommendations 7

Part II: RECOMMENDATIONS

Number 1. For a national manpower policy. 12
Number 2. For training of welfare recipients. 15
Number 3. For improvements in on-the-job training . . . 17
Number 4. For expansion of apprenticeship opportunities. 20
Number 5. For improvement in quality of training. . . . 22
Number 6. For residential vocational education centers 25
Number 7. For increased levels of funding 27
Number 8. For improved appropriation provisions 29
Number 9. For streamlining approval procedures. 32
Number 10. For local authority to re-program 33
Number 11. For continuation of multi-agency program responsibilities. 34
Number 12. For expansion of comprehensive planning . . . 37
Number 13. For enforcement of equal opportunity. 39
Number 14. For strengthening State Employment Services . 41
Number 15. For elimination of regional incongruities . . 44
Number 16. For better communication. 46
Number 17. For better data and evaluation. 48
Number 18. For greater use of program linkages 50
Number 19. For greater involvement of vocational education 55
Number 20. For expansion of staff training 57

APPENDIXES

Table I Summary Listing of Programs 60
Table II Program Characteristics 68
Activities of Committee 73
List of Witnesses and Other Persons Who Attended Committee Meetings. 76
List of Committee, Subcommittee and Staff Site Visits and Special Activities 78

Preface

In October 1966, the Congress and the President, on enacting P. L. 89-787, the Fiscal Year 1967 Appropriation for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, accepted Conference Report 2331 containing Amendment 32, which stated (italics supplied):

> "...$150,000 of this appropriation shall be available only for transfer to the appropriation 'Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses' for *a comprehensive study of the administration of training programs financed partially or wholly with federal funds.* The conferees do not intend that this study include training programs that agencies operate for their own employees or training of professional personnel but rather training under such programs as vocational education, institutional, and on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, apprenticeship and training program, Job Corps, specialized training programs under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, work experience program, work-study program, Neighborhood Youth Corps, etc.
>
> "*The study is to have as its principal purposes to determine if there is waste, duplication, and inefficiency in administering these programs as many individual programs and, if this determination is in the affirmative, to make recommendations for correction.* This study is to be made by a committee of experts in the field, none of whom are to be Federal Government employees, to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare after consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is the opinion of the conferees that it would be preferable if the committee's staff was also selected from outside the Federal Government."

The Committee, formally to become the Committee on Administration of Training Programs (CATP), began work in April 1967 and completed its assignment in March 1968.

The nearly 30 Federally assisted training programs which constitute the concern of the Committee are of two types. Those training programs that were directly established on a statutory base are principally those in the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, the Social Security Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and the several Vocational Education Acts. In addition, special programs were established by administrative action in order to serve special target groups or to provide better delivery systems and improved coordination.

Manpower Development and Training Act, as amended:

MDTA, Institutional
MDTA, Part-time and Other-than-Skill
MDTA, On-the-Job Training
MDTA, Coupled
MDTA, Experimental and Demonstration
MDTA, Training for Redevelopment Area Residents
MDTA, Correctional Institutions

Economic Opportunity Act, as amended:

Neighborhood Youth Corps
Operation Mainstream (Nelson)
New Careers (Scheuer)
Special Impact (Kennedy-Javits)
Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers Program
Manpower Components of Community Action Programs
Adult Basic Education in Community Action Programs
Indian Training Programs
Research and Demonstration
Job Corps
Work Experience and Training

Various Educational Acts:

Adult Basic Education
Vocational Education
Work-Study Program

Social Security Act:

Community Work and Training
Work Incentive Program (will replace Work Experience and training and Community Work and Training Programs)

Vocational Rehabilitation Act:

Vocational Rehabilitation
Vocational Rehabilitation-Disability Beneficiaries

National Apprenticeship Training Act of 1937

Apprenticeship Programs

Selected Administratively Established Programs:

Five Cities Test Project (Ghetto Aid)
Concentrated Employment Programs (CEP)
Operation SER (Spanish-American Programs)

In Tables I and II of the Appendixes the character, purpose, scope, and funding of each program are listed, along with the administrative responsibility, as of the beginning of 1968.

The Committee wishes to acknowledge with appreciation the extensive assistance it received from its research contractor, Greenleigh Associates, of New York, New York, in gathering and assimilating information for this study, and in formulating and preparing these recommendations.

The Committee wishes to acknowledge with appreciation the dedicated effort of its Research Director, Dr. Vernon M. Briggs, Jr.

The Committee has benefited immeasurably by the unstinting cooperation of numerous individuals within and without the Federal service. Special though incomplete recognition of these persons is indicated by the listings in the Appendixes.

Part I: Summary of Findings and Recommendations

General Findings

The Committee was asked to determine "if there is waste, duplication, and inefficiency in administering the (federally supported training) programs as many individual programs, and if this determination is in the affirmative, to make recommendations for correction."

Although the Committee found that some waste, duplication, and inefficiency* existed in the nearly thirty separate federally supported job training programs operated during the period of this study, the Committee observed that these failings rarely were severe enough to vitiate the usefulness of the programs.

The waste, duplication, and inefficiency which do exist arise in part, but only in limited part, from administration of the programs as many individual programs. Furthermore, during the period of the Committee's study, some programs have been consolidated and otherwise changed to a significant extent, so that the situation today is not what it was when the Committee began its work and certainly not what it was when the Congress asked that the study be begun. This report treats the situation existing at the beginning of 1968.

Prior to this date, many of the community officials and leaders the Committee contacted described the nearly thirty programs as duplicative to a confusing degree. Legislative and administrative changes instituted in the past several months by the President and the Congress, as exemplified by the Economic Opportunity Amendments Act of 1967, will help to reduce some of the unnecessary duplication.

Some duplication of programs and of administering agencies at all levels may be useful, however, in order that unforeseeable failure of any one person or agency or program to perform up to standard will not be catastrophic to the individuals served. The Committee has encountered instances in which duplication was introduced intentionally from time to time into particular programs by federal, state, or local officials, specifically (not always admittedly) for this purpose. Instances of unnecessary duplication which need correction are treated in the recommendations to follow.

---

* The terms "waste," "duplication," and "inefficiency" have various definitions and connotations. According to The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (Unabridged ed.; New York: Random House 1966), accepted definitions include:

Waste - Useless consumption or expenditure; use without adequate return.
Duplication - Anything corresponding in all respects to something else.
Inefficiency - Inability to effect or achieve the desired result with reasonable economy of means.

Problems of inefficiency arising out of the separate administration of the programs were likewise encountered. One in particular stands out painfully. In almost every community contacted, citizens and officials mentioned instances in which training program fund requests were initiated and forwarded to funding authorities, trainees selected and facilities and services set aside -- only to be followed by months of indecision. Some of the delays were found to have arisen from confusion or dispute among programs officers at various levels -- local, State, regional, and Washington -- and in various programs, regarding policies, purview, or authority to act. Some of the delays were the result of misdirected or inadequate or inept effort by the original requester. Some stemmed from vacillation on the part of one or more administrators.

Often the principal cause for delay was that the Congress did not make clear, until months after the change of the fiscal year, what level of funds would be available. Invariably too few funds were available compared with the hopes held out. Inevitably the complications of government operations -- local, state, and national -- caused unanticipated delay. During the passing months valuable staff time at all levels was wasted. The willingness of local leaders to initiate further efforts diminished. And numerous trainees, either not comprehending the ponderous ways of bureaucratic government or alienated by the seeming lack of interest in their fate, became frustrated and drifted away.

Many a disadvantaged individual now has little faith that the programs will help him. Thus the inefficient processing of program fund requests has led not only to a waste of tangible resources but also to a waste of a faith vital to effective continuing operation.

A second important waste of resources and faith has arisen from distortion of the training programs in some ill-advised communities into income maintenance conduits in which little meaningful training is provided The out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Work Experience Programs in particular have been misused. The participants, perceiving how little training was offered and what little accomplishment expected, gained no incentive and lost faith. The public, regaled by stories of indolence and seeing little benefit, wondered.

The single most important waste found, however -- a waste of vital significance to the Nation -- can be stated simply to be the waste of years in the lives of millions of our citizens stemming from the inadequate level of funding of these training programs. Estimates provided to the CATP indicated a very small fraction of the potential clientele is being served -- and many of these in less than optimal fashion. It was evident to the Committee that millions of the Nation's families have looked to their government with faith and with hope for the alleviation of the grim poverty that envelops their lives. The training programs were seen by many to be the way to a better future. Hundreds of thousands of men and women have benefitted. But for many more -- hundreds of thousands -- hope and faith are being replaced by disillusionment and cynicism.

The only means to remedy this is to increase substantially the goals and funds for the training programs in the next several years. The Committee is confident that the Nation possesses the physical and human resources to operate these programs at a realistic and meaningful level. Further, it believes that by putting these resources to work now the Nation can, in the years ahead, realize substantial savings in welfare costs and other costs associated with joblessness.

The specific recommendations summarized below, and elucidated subsequently, present the Committee's suggestions for improving the administration of the training programs at the federal, state, and local levels of government. The Committee believes the changes suggested will measurably restore confidence that the programs can and will work, and will put our resources into meaningful action in a reasonably short period of time.

The Committee is acutely aware that the recommendations proposed here do not resolve all issues of consequence affecting the administration of the training programs, and the Committee recognizes in all humility that its recommendations do not encompass every problem it perceived. In the words of Amendment 32, its Charter, quoted in full in the Preface, the Committee was to "determine if there is waste, duplication, and inefficiency in administering these programs as many individual programs and, if this determination is in the affirmative, to make recommendations for correction." To accomplish this task, the Committee sought first to identify what principal inefficiencies appeared to beset each program or were common to several programs. Then, the Committee attempted to assess whether the stated objectives of each could better be obtained by some change of administration of that program, including any change of the administrative relationships of that program with the others.

The Committee became progressively more conscious of the enormity and complexity of its task. To expedite its work the Committee restricted its concern whenever possible to examining solely the administrative practices characterizing each program rather than evaluating the overall performance of each. The Committee decided not to undertake any detailed economic benefit-cost evaluation of the various training programs, because of limitations of time and resources and because of the non-existence of benefit-cost evaluation models for the various programs.

Also, the Committee planned to determine what actual impact on trainee income was being attained by examining the post-training employment history of a modest statistical sample of trainees, but found that it was not possible except at undue cost even to select any such sample from the crude records available. Thus, this quest was dropped.

To its continuing concern, the Committee found all too often that specific data were unavailable or inadequate. While voluminous records are maintained by these programs, recording the on-going detailed operations of the programs, and while the Committee received much help from many senior officials at all levels of government, only a small amount of assimilated quantitative data of sufficient quality were found available to be useful. This lack of data forced the Committee to rely more than it desired on qualitative and attitudinal inputs. This experience is reflected in Recommendation 17, for improvement in data collection and evaluation.

The Committee hopes that continuing definitive review of the administration of the training programs will occur, under some appropriate auspices, and that the Congress will provide for and support generously such an effort.

Recommendations

Policy Recommendations

1. National manpower policy, currently expressed only through an incoherent aggregation of laws and practices, needs to be definitively formulated and codified. Goals, commitments, priorities and constraints need to be delineated. Interrelationships between employment, training, education, and welfare policies need to be explicit.

2. Individuals receiving welfare benefits who can profit from training should be assured the opportunity to do so. When they do, and if they receive training stipends, they should not be penalized by comparable loss of welfare benefits.

   Furthermore, welfare benefits should not be contingent upon entry into training or work situations. In this latter connection, the relevant 1967 Amendments to the Social Security Act are to be deplorable. In no way should any program designed for hard-core unemployed individuals be converted into a punitive instrument. As a part of the Work Incentive Program now being organized for recipients of aid to families with dependent children, a special program for disadvantaged families should be designed and financed, and directed to select certain communities to pioneer the development of new methods to assist these families.

3. Attention should be given to serious problems that exist in the conception, operation, and administration of programs involving on-the-job training. Unless this training structure is developed in a sound manner it will continue to fail to meet adequately the needs of disadvantaged workers for meaningful employment opportunities.

4. With expanding employment opportunities in the more skilled areas, efforts to expand apprenticeship should be increased, and programs to assist in the establishment of a flow of qualified applicants from minority groups should be given high priority. Specifically, programs similar to the joint apprenticeship program co-sponsored by the Workers Defense League and the A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund in New York should be expanded. Stipulations in the Model Cities legislation for the maximum participation of indigenous residents in the rehabilitation of slums should be implemented in a manner designed to provide the workers the opportunity to acquire meaningful skills.

5. Even if it is necessary to reduce the number of individuals served, training offered under the various programs should be adequate for entry into jobs which have the promise of advancement and/or adequate income for participants. The content of a disturbing percentage of the courses offered is not sufficient to assure placement in the occupation for which the individual is trained. Others lead to jobs which produce insufficient income for a family to survive. Courses having these deficiences should be dropped.

6. Residential vocational education centers as authorized under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 should be set up in local communities to serve disadvantaged youths who have need for both occupational instruction and a different living environment, but who now are served only by distant Job Corp centers. The age group served by the Job Corps should be raised to a minimum age of seventeen.

Funding Recommendations

7. The level of funding for the training programs must be raised substantially if these activities are to make visible inroads

into the problems they seek to remedy. The present level of funding is inadequate to provide meaningful training for many of those currently enrolled in programs, let along the vast numbers whom the programs should be serving.

8. The current congressional practice of funding programs months after the beginning of the fiscal year is the most pervasive source of inefficiency in the present administration of training programs and should be changed to permit reasonable time for programing operations.

The requirement that all funds be obligated by the end of the fiscal year, under these circumstances, is unrealistic. The period of obligation should be made longer than twelve months.

9. Funding procedures and delegations of approval authority should be studied to identify and eliminate non-essential reviews and other causes of unnecessary delay. An effort should be made to modify the course-by-course funding procedures of skill centers.

10. In communities where training programs are planned and funded on a comprehensive basis, at least ten percent of the funding allocated should be available to the prime sponsor for use on a flexible basis.

Organizational Recommendations

11. Proposals to consolidate the administration of all of the many current training programs into one single Federal agency -- presently existing or to be established -- are inappropriate at this time. Some years hence such a step may well be advantageous. Now, while rapid innovations in program content are occurring, new target clientele being designated, and various administrative lines of authority being tested, it appears preferable to focus the expertise of the specialized Federal agencies on distinguishable tasks, and to observe the results. However, efforts should be made now to integrate existing activities within the Department of Labor, where the programs today are concentrated, into a smaller number of general program offerings.

12. Comprehensive planning at the community level should be expanded, and funds should be provided for strengthening the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System.

13. Because discrimination in hiring and upgrading influences adversely the opportunities for minorities to participate in training programs for jobs of higher skills, every applicable law designed to prohibit discriminatory practices must be more aggressively enforced. Agencies involved in administering training programs must strengthen their ability to monitor these programs in order to eliminate discriminatory practices.

14. The quality of personnel and the performance capabilities of the State Employment Services should be improved. General revenue funds should be used to supplement the employer payroll taxes as a source of financial support. If recognition in the form of demonstrated actions by the states as to the vital responsibilities incumbent upon these services in the achievement of national manpower goals is not forthcoming, consideration should be given to the substitution of a Federal Employment Service for the present arrangement.

15. To the extent feasible, the regional boundaries and headquarter cities of the several Federal agencies which are engaged in manpower programs should be made congruent.

Procedural Recommendations

16. Internal program communications and inter-program communications must be improved. Neither the individuals who are potential trainees, nor the local officials or leaders in the communities in which they reside, nor the state administrators of pertinent agencies, nor even numerous involved Federal officials, appear to comprehend the scope, the distribution, the diversity, the applicability, or the limitations of the multitude of training programs now in operation. Information for trainees should be made available in neighborhood centers on a "one-stop" basis.

17. Because data on program performance and trainee status, characteristics, and accomplishments are limited or unavailable to the degree that meaningful evaluation of the benefits and costs of these activities appears precluded, a comprehensive and expeditious system of data collection must be put into being immediately. Report requirements for all programs should be made comparable, and conciseness stressed. Results should be made available for objective study and evaluation.

18. More use should be made of jointly supported projects and of program linkages. Existing procedures for joint conduct or funding of training efforts in local communities using components from the several independent programs are now so troublesome that program sponsors commonly avoid their use out of exasperation. These procedures must be restructured, and then reinforced by cross funding allocations. In particular, first, an appropriate portion of MDTA funds should be reserved at the community level for enrollees cycled through from lower-skill work and training programs. Inequitable income payment systems that hamper trainee mobility between programs should be eliminated.

Second, at least 50 percent of the funds awarded each state for Adult Basic Education under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should be reserved for use in community training projects which couple basic education with job training or work experience.

Third, a portion of the funds for vocational rehabilitation should be earmarked by the Rehabilitation Services Administration for use in manpower training efforts.

19. A substantial amount of funds authorized under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 should be earmarked for persons with "special needs" as defined in that Act, and used by the vocational education system in conjunction with community comprehensive work and training programs for youth and adults. In addition to in-school vocational education programs, out-reach programs aimed at youth outside the school system should be developed and should include cooperative programs (i.e., institutional training plus part-time training-related employment).

Staff Training Recommendation

20. Opportunities for inservice training should be available for the administrators and key personnel of the Manpower Programs at all levels of administration. Specifically, a manpower institute should be established; more extensive use made of available resources of continuing education programs at colleges and universities; and regular face-to-face briefings should be held to inform operating personnel of the findings of research and experimental and demonstration projects.

Part II: Recommendations

1. National manpower policy, currently expressed only through an incoherent aggregation of laws and practices, needs to be definitively formulated and codified. Goals, commitments, priorities and constraints need to be delineated. Interrelationships between employment, training, education, and welfare policies need to be explicit.

Prior to 1962 there were only two Federal programs of major significance in the manpower area that were directly concerned with training: grants-in-aid to the States for vocational education in the schools, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the promotion of apprenticeship programs, administered by the Department of Labor.

Then in 1962 the Manpower Development and Training Act came as the first of a series of laws designed to encourage and provide direct Federal support for training and re-training unemployed and underemployed persons on a nation-wide basis.

Economic and social changes had begun to re-shape former attitudes that limited the role of government in the development of our human resources. Advancing technology continued the shifting and re-structuring of industrial, occupational, and geographic employment patterns; the rotting decay in urban slums became starkly evident, and their density increased; the labor force increased sharply, yet the overall unemployment rate was pushed down -- but in rural pockets of poverty and in the ghettos this rate was a mockery; the rising stream of the economy flowed past the un-skilled, the disadvantaged, and the discriminated-against; civil disorders struck.

The waste of human resources -- and indeed the danger of such waste -- resulting from poor education, social bigotry, economic exploitation, and political neglect became dramatically clear.

In rapid sequence legislative enactments following the MDTA laid the groundwork for a variety of manpower programs. Each of these programs, established by specific provisions in the laws or by administrative formulation, has been conceived as different from the others in its special purposes, its modes of operation, or its resources. However, they all are part of the manpower effort and by that fact are interrelated. They do not operate in separate theaters through different agencies with discrete target groups.

The Committee believes that a great deal of good has been accomplished in the various manpower programs. Each has its successes. And it is a positive thing to have had the range of trial and experiment that has been afforded in these first years by the innovative character of so many patterns.

But goals have become fragmented and priorities have become blurred. Program policy makers and administrative officials at all levels tend to have "tunnel vision" in decision-making in the context of their respective responsibilities. The need is to relate all their activities to the central thrust of the total manpower effort.

The time has now come to articulate the governing manpower policy to guide, coordinate, and reinforce the activities of the related programs. The enunciation of (a) the general goal or set of goals, (b) the basic guidelines to be observed, and (c) the responsibilities might well prove to be more helpful in eliminating waste, duplication, and inefficiency than any other single measure.

The Committee does not propose to prescribe the full coverage and all components of that policy. It does desire to report on certain aspects on which it has deliberated. The matter of priorities, for example, should provide flexibility. In the circumstance today of a relatively low overall unemployment rate contrasted with an alarmingly high rate for youth, particularly in the ghetto, a major effort for developing the employment potential of unemployed youth is virtually dictated. In another circumstance priority might well be accorded in different fashion.

Obviously, a meaningful manpower policy must also be concerned with such matters as the adequacy of labor market information, including occupational and manpower projections; the need to strengthen labor market instruments such as the employment service,whose function it is to facilitate the matching of workers and jobs; and the development of improved programs to provide counseling, testing, training, and evaluation procedures.

The Committee believes that training programs should be restricted to the preparation of individuals for jobs which will provide income well above subsistence levels, and which have promise of advancement.

The Committee believes that some of the present training projects are not realistically designed for future employment but are conceived as simply income-maintenance activity. It deplores this.

The Committee believes that public employment programs should be available for unemployed persons.

The Committee also believes that for those families and individuals who cannot earn adequate income in either private or public employment, sufficient income must be provided in some form of transfer payment system, whether guaranteed adequate welfare payments, the so-called negative income tax, or other form.

Therefore, the Committee urges that thoughtful and deliberate effort be given to development of the manpower policy; and that such policy be conceived in relation to the Nation's problems in education, welfare, and urban needs and that it reinforce a fiscal and monetary policy aimed at full employment.

A policy framework to provide for structuring of goals and priorities, interrelationships with economic and social programs, and consideration of fiscal and monetary policy should be designed to permit the development of comprehensive program costs estimates and budgets for alternative courses of action. The true measure of adequacy of the policy will be the extent to which it supports and leads to the commitment of funds by the Congress and the Administration.

2. Individuals receiving welfare benefits who can profit from training should be assured the opportunity to do so. When they do, and if they receive training stipends, they should not be penalized by comparable loss of welfare benefits.

   Furthermore, welfare benefits should not be contingent upon entry into training or work situations. In this latter connection, the relevant 1967 Amendments to the Social Security Act are to be deplored. In no way should any program designed for hard-core unemployed individuals be converted into a punitive instrument. As a part of the Work Incentive Program now being organized for recipients of aid to families with dependent children, a special program for disadvantaged families should be designed and financed, and directed to select certain communities to pioneer the development of new methods to assist these families.

Special attention must be given to training those who are on the Nation's steadily expanding welfare rolls.

In 1962, the Congress recognized the need to establish a special training program for welfare clients when it amended Title IV of the Social Security Act. This measure, known as Community Work and Training, soon was followed by the more liberally financed Work Experience Program created under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Both of these programs were designed with full appreciation that training alone will not make many welfare recipients employable. The welfare clients need counseling before, during, and after their training, as an integral part of the total effort to assist their entry into the labor market. Most need remedial education and instruction in basic work habits. Many cannot participate unless adequate child care facilities are available. Both of these programs contained provisions to provide a wide range of supportive services.

In some instances these supportive services alone have been sufficient to enable the individual to find employment. But normally a combination of the supportive services and occupational training is needed.

Just prior to the beginning of 1968, the Social Security Act was again amended to establish the Work Incentive Program for families receiving Aid for Dependent Children benefits. The two forerunner programs are to be replaced by this new program. The precise guidelines for the new program are being written at the time of preparation of this report. The Congress ordered the program to be administered by the Department of Labor with cooperation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Committee concurs that it is advantageous for the Department of Labor to administer this effort as a useful step in consolidation of work and training programs. However, the Committee wishes to call attention to the need for an exceedingly close working tie between the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity on this program.

Many of the families to be served, because of their background, insecurities, and inadequacies, show little interest in training programs and potential earners need to be motivated to enroll and continue in such programs. While this hard-to-reach group of families represents only a small percentage of the total number of welfare cases, studies have shown that they account for a disproportionately large portion of the total welfare funds. If the chain of dependency within these families is to be broken -- and if training and placement in meaningful jobs is to occur -- it will take the combined efforts and skills not only of Department of Labor employment counselors and training personnel, but also of family social workers and outreach workers of the other Departments, working in a coordinated approach. To assure that such an approach does become adopted, the Committee proposes that as a part of the new overall Work Incentive Program being organized by the Department of Labor, a major experimental subprogram be included for the hard-core families. The several Departments by joint agreement should select at least several large and small communities in which the development of new methods of treatment for these families can best be explored, and proceed to form a joint enterprise to carry out an extended program.

It will be necessary to arrange for larger incentive payments than are provided in the new law if the Work Incentive Program is to succeed. Under no circumstances should mandatory participation in training be made an inescapable eligibility requirement for welfare benefits. The amendments to the 1967 Social Security Act that make the Work Incentive Program a punitive vehicle are deplorable. There are many individuals who receive welfare benefits who are not in a position to enter the labor market. The training provided should be of sufficient quality and duration to assure employment opportunities to the entrants in career positions that will produce an annual income clearly above minimum poverty levels. The training should not be permitted to become a substitute form of income maintenance.

3. Attention should be given to serious problems that exist in the conception, operation, and administration of programs involving on-the-job training. Unless this training structure is developed in a sound manner it will continue to fail to meet adequately the needs of disadvantaged workers for meaningful employment opportunities.

The Committee found that the various programs involving on-the-job training had numerous defects. If the private sector is to take a more active and meaningful part in government-financed training programs, these defects must be corrected.

The present on-the-job training (OJT) programs tend to neglect the truly disadvantaged workers. Even when they are enrolled in programs, the supportive services provided them are inadequate to meet their needs. In addition, the training under these programs is often of questionable quality and is too frequently aimed at jobs which virtually are meaningless. Moreover, there is only cursory monitoring of programs, program evaluation is insufficient, and excessive paper work requirements are forced upon contractors. On top of all this, there is excessive duplication in the area of job development.

Even if the stories of the same employer being contacted by numerous OJT contractors are exaggerated, and even if duplication were infrequent, the conditions which give rise to them should be corrected. One suggestion is that there should be a master plan in order to prevent duplication in job development efforts.

Some efforts to deal with the most glaring weaknesses in the OJT programs have been undertaken. The MA-1 and MA-2 programs, which involve national contracts for training by industry and the private sector, have been developed in order to try to deal more effectively with the needs of the disadvantaged, and the employment program announced in the President's 1968 State of the Union Message has the same group as its target. Moreover, in December 1967, responsibilities for manpower activities within the Manpower Administration were reassigned in order to provide a better tie-in between the government-financed OJT programs and other government-financed work and training programs. The result was the creation of the Bureau of Work-Training Programs (BWTP), which now has these OJT activities as one of its responsibilities.

This administrative shift, combined with the parallel policy emphasis to increase involvement of private industry in training the disadvantaged, places special significance on the role of the Bureau of Work-Training Programs.

Having been assigned responsibility for the OJT activity, the Bureau of Work-Training Programs should give close attention to building an effective structure that will provide training in skilled and semiskilled occupations. Equal attention should be given to technical training and to the training of instructors throughout industry.

The Bureau of Work-Training Programs should not be content only with promoting OJT slots. It should also encourage the development of instructional and communication skills for training personnel which will lead to a pool of skilled industrial instructors. It must also develop methods and systems to recruit training personnel -- including training directors, instructors and specialists in supportive services. It should strive to standardize administrative systems for all OJT programs used by industry -- particularly record-keeping -- so that these techniques can have an impact on the learning situation on and off the job. Furthermore, it should discover and widely publicize the most effective training methods and assist in the development and dissemination of the best in training materials -- including text books, instructional materials, and other aids for training in industry. Cooperation with industry, particularly with trade associations and unions, and other private and public agencies concerned with OJT activities, should be aggressively pursued.

It is hoped that the Bureau will also address itself vigorously to the other defects from which OJT programs suffer, especially the lack of adequate monitoring of projects and the almost complete absence of program evaluation.

The Committee was disturbed that so little evaluation has been done in view of the major policy decision to place greater emphasis on government-financed programs involving OJT. Without an effective evaluation program, serious policy questions, including questions that go to the very concept of these programs, will remain unanswered.

For example, the majority of the trainees under MDTA-OJT programs have been white high school graduates. These are workers who have a natural advantage in the job market. Is it appropriate public policy to use limited public financial resources to reimburse employers for training costs -- costs which the employer has traditionally expected to bear on his own -- for this group?

If government financial assistance is involved, should public policy permit the employer to be free to select the workers for whom he will be reimbursed training costs?

If the jobs are at the entry level, for what kind of costs should the government assume responsibility? Should it be for occupational training (in the narrow sense), or should it be for supportive services and basic education?

If the major disadvantage of the individual is in the area of education, does the present OJT structure permit this handicap to be dealt with effectively?

To what extent may government financial assistance to train workers for entry-level jobs -- where occupational training is minimal -- lead to the displacement of workers already on the job, doing the same work, but for whom the employer receives no reimbursement?

These are but a few of the questions that arise for which no clear-cut answers exist. Moreover, there seems to be no effort directed toward providing the answers. Rather, the OJT program has grown like Topsy and reflects little concern with the need for a sound conceptual framework.

Until some serious thinking goes into the development of such a conceptual framework, and the program is tightened accordingly, present OJT activities can lead (1) to the expenditure of funds for projects of doubtful validity, (2) to subsidies to employers for doing what they would normally do anyway, and (3) to the development of employment opportunities for the unemployed poor at the expense of the employed poor, who may be displaced in the process.

4. With expanding employment opportunities in the more skilled areas, efforts to expand apprenticeship should be increased, and programs to assist in the establishment of a flow of qualified applicants from minority groups should be given high priority. Specifically, programs similar to the joint apprenticeship program co-sponsored by the Workers Defense League and the A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund in New York should be expanded. Stipulations in the Model Cities legislation for the maximum participation of indigenous residents in the rehabilitation of slums should be implemented in a manner designed to provide the workers the opportunity to acquire meaningful skills.

Apprenticeship programs should be encouraged and expanded for two extremely sound reasons. First, they can efficiently teach job skills at a very low public cost, and second, they can lead to relatively well-paying employment and more success in the job market.

Too many workers are now employed in occupations and establishments where apprenticeship programs would be appropriate, but are not to be found. Thus, many are denied the opportunity to learn all of the skills of their trade. The consequence, of course, is that they are less mobile and less successful in the job market.

It also means that certain firms and employers who do provide training through apprenticeship programs are not only meeting their obligations to society and to their employees, but they are, in fact, shouldering the burdens of others. The inequity of this situation is obvious. Equally obvious is the adverse effect that it has upon the orderly functioning of the job market. It is a problem that must be corrected.

Not only does the growth of the apprenticeship programs need to be encouraged, there is also a need to develop improved information channels to acquaint young people, and those who are in a position to guide them in career choices, with the opportunities for training that do exist. This is especially true for those from minority groups -- Negroes, Indians, Puerto Ricans, and those of Mexican heritage. New support must be given to the development of programs which help minority-group youth to find their way into apprenticeship for training.

Programs such as those initiated for jobs in the apprenticeable trades by the Workers Defense League in New York City (which have since spread to a number of other cities through the participation of organizations such as the Urban League and unions in the construction industry) represent a most concrete effort to give minority-group youth the chance to obtain highly-skilled jobs. Admittedly, such opportunities are limited because of the relatively small number of apprentice positions. However, these programs are of such symbolic significance that they should be given a high priority in the allocation of manpower administration funds so that they can spread to as many large cities as possible.

These programs are based on the premise that there will be development of a rapport with apprenticeship sponsors. The program goal is to provide disadvantaged youth with an opportunity to compete on an equal basis for the available openings. This is done by establishing recruitment channels within the minority community, by preparing young people through special tutorial classes, and by providing assistance to the young workers once they are on the job.

Another vehicle which offers promise in channeling minority-group youth into apprenticeship programs is the Apprenticeship Information Center, a program which is operating in several communities as part of the public employment service. Under this arrangement, advisory committees representing labor, management, education, and minority groups are formed to facilitate the exchange of information between apprenticeship sponsors and prospective participants. In those communities where it has been given proper leadership, such as in the District of Columbia, the Apprenticeship Information Center has proved to be a most effective instrument in helping minority-group youth to gain entry into apprenticeship programs. In some communities, the Centers need to be strengthened, and consideration should be given to expanding this network to additional cities, provided it does not lead to unnecessary duplication of other efforts to achieve the same goal.

Under the Model Cities Act of 1966 it was stipulated that a maximum number of indigenous persons be employed to rebuild their slum communities. Once Federal funds are committed, another obligation is assumed--that of making sure that the slum dwellers are employed, not in some token fashion, but at a meaningful level. Their employment should lead to the acquisition of skills that eventually will enable them to be full-fledged members of the industrial work force and not just neighborhood handymen.

Because one usually must become a journeyman to succeed in the construction industry, the major thrust of the manpower programs developed under Model Cities Act should be directed toward emphasizing entrance into the various trades through the apprenticeship system. Furthermore, skill improvement programs should be made available for those who have some, but not all, of the qualifications needed to become qualified journeymen.

5. Even if it is necessary to reduce the number of individuals served, training offered under the various programs should be adequate for entry into jobs which have the promise of advancement and/or adequate income for participants. The content of a disturbing percentage of the courses offered is not sufficient to assure placement in the occupation for which the individual is trained. Others lead to jobs which produce insufficient income for a family to survive. Courses having these deficiencies should be dropped.

The Committee heard many expressions of criticism about the quality of training programs. These criticisms came from participants, from instructors, and from administrators at various levels, as well as from Governors and Mayors whose views were conveyed in letters to the Committee.

Clearly, improvement in the quality of training requires some deliberate decision-making at the policy level. Inadequate training is bad enough. But to compound it with training that seeks to prepare workers for jobs which are not only low-wage, but dead-end as well, is inexcusable.

Problems with respect to programs involving on-the-job training are discussed elsewhere in this report. The discussion here has reference primarily to MDTA institutional programs, although many of the criticisms over the types of jobs for which workers are being trained and the earnings those jobs provide, are no less applicable to other programs, including those which involved on-the-job training.

The improvement in the quality of training programs which the Committee seeks may very well involve a decision -- given the present level of funding -- to train fewer people, but to train them better and for more meaningful jobs. Of necessity, such a redirection will very likely mean programs of longer duration and correspondingly greater costs per trainee. Moreover, in order to enable the trainees to sustain themselves and their families over this longer period, and to reduce the likelihood of persons dropping out of programs in order to obtain whatever temporary advantages may be offered by regular jobs even at relatively low wages, the level of the training allowance should be raised.

The fact of the matter is that the Congress has authorized MDTA programs for up to 104 weeks. The purpose of this amendment was obviously designed to enable the program administrators to provide training in more meaningful occupations. But this is not the direction in which the overall program is moving -- at least, not with any notable speed or in any significant degree. Instead, we seem to have been bogged down from the very beginnings of MDTA in a kind of "numbers" game with which the Committee is singularly unimpressed.

In early days, and not without justification, MDTA institutional programs were charged with creaming the upper levels of the labor force to fill available training slots. This practice was obviously the result of a very loose labor market, in which many highly-qualified, highly-motivated workers were unemployed. In the drive to assure a successful placement record, administrators steered these workers into MDTA programs, whether or not they really needed the additional training for employability. The fact is that, with the pickup in employment that began in 1963, these workers would probably have been absorbed by the labor market without the benefit of these training programs.

In the process, the more-disadvantaged workers were pretty much ignored. And although the overall MDTA program has been improved, it is still not designed to provide the kind of training it should be offering to the disadvantaged workers -- that is, the opportunity to receive training for employment in occupations which are meaningful and which provide a satisfactory income and a path out of poverty and deprivation. Instead, these disadvantaged workers are frequently placed in programs which, though the occupations involved require minimal skills, stipulate unjustifiably long training periods. Very often the most disadvantaged workers are precluded from participating in even these programs because the essential supportive services are inadequate.

There are, of course, some MDTA programs which seek to train disadvantaged workers for some of the better jobs. But even here the Committee heard expressions of misgivings from administrators. For example, at the East Bay Skills Center the feeling was that the training on the whole was not good enough to train really-qualified technicians and, in fact, was barely good enough to prepare trainees for entry at the bottom rung. And no doubt, it is this kind of situation which causes many graduates of MDTA institutional programs to have difficulty in finding jobs in occupations for which they have supposedly been trained.

The fact that many program and project administrators are aware of shortcomings in the quality of MDTA training does not assure speedy remedy. There is some striving for improvement, but much remans to be done. And it will be done only if there is a conscious effort at the policy level to provide the necessary program design.

MDTA could and should be providing training for jobs which have the promise of advancement and adequate compensation. Such training should have a battery of supportive and remedial services in order to enable disadvantaged persons to participate effectively. Thus, MDTA's role in the complex of manpower programs should be to prepare workers for more meaningful jobs.

The Committee is so firm in its desire to attain quality results that it is willing to suggest that fewer people be served if this is the only way to accomplish the goal. The other option, far preferable, is that the amount of funds for these programs should be substantially increased, so that more -- rather than fewer -- people can be served in a meaningful way.

6. Residential **vocational** education centers as authorized under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 should be set up in local communities to serve disadvantaged youths who have need for both occupational instruction and a different living environment, but who now are served only by distant Job Corp centers. The age group served by the Job Corps should be raised to a minimum age of seventeen.

The Committee recommends that the proposed system of residential vocational education that was authorized by Section 14 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 now be implemented.

The young who today need to leave their home environment to find vocational instruction have recourse only to the Job Corps, whose centers are often located many miles from their home town. Yet from the limited data available, estimates are that over 90 percent of those who enter the Job Corps return to their home areas to seek employment. In some instances, it seems, the training received at a distant Job Corps Center is not directly related to the needs of the home labor market of a trainee.

On the other hand, residential vocational education schools could combine occupational instruction, proximity to the trainees' home town, a better learning environment than the home provides, and more effective job placement assistance. The residential vocational education centers would not be a substitute for the Job Corps program. Rather, they would be another weapon in the arsenal.

The Job Corps has the highest cost per trainee of any of the programs studied by the Committee (estimated to be $6,700 in 1967). For this reason alone, it is important to assess carefully the experiences of its trainees. The residential vocational education school may be both more beneficial to the individual and less costly to the public. The detailed evaluation of the Job Corps program that is specified in the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act should incorporate both considerations in the proposed review.

As now operated the Job Corps program has a high dropout rate. Because of the high individual training expense, a Job Corps dropout costs more than a dropout from any other program. Under current legislation, the maximum enrollment period is two years. The typical curriculum, however, is designed to last about nine months and a 1966 sample survey revealed that the median stay was a scant 4.3 months. During the Committee's visit to Camp Parks in Pleasanton, California, officials there indicated that the quoted survey figure approximated their own experience. A partial explanation for the high dropout rate is that the average age level of the trainees is declining (in the same survey, 16 and 17 year olds accounted for 55% of all trainees, and as a group they averaged a three-month stay in the program). Hence, the Committee recommends that the minimum age for those who live at these centers be raised to seventeen years.

Aside from the direct relationship between the age of the trainee and the length of time he remains a Corpsman, there is evidence that most trainees return to their original localities after their stint in the Corps. The lack of coordination between the placement activities of the camps and the distant employment service office in the trainees' home towns has been a serious issue of concern. Furthermore, the skill training that the Corpsmen receive in the camps may not be in demand in the local labor market to which they return. There have also been difficulties with youthful enrollees who received training in one State for occupations from which they were barred by law in their home states.

Although the Committee recognizes that there are circumstances in which youths need to be removed from their immediate family or local environment to benefit from training, it does not follow that the Job Corps approach is the only solution. A system of residential vocational education schools could provide a bridge between the general objectives and the present means for assisting such individuals. The proposed system would allow youths to be trained in or near their home city for occupations that the local labor market needs and for which they could legally be employed. They also could have some access to friends and relatives on occasion and they could spend their leisure hours in an area with which they are reasonably familiar. At the same time, by being required to live at such centers, they could be supervised to a degree that would prevent them from returning regularly to the environment from which they came. The young men and women could be housed in YMCA and YWCA facilities leased by the government, or even in private homes. This would enable the program to begin without waiting for the construction of housing facilities.

It follows, of course, that the system of vocational residential centers would receive the same funding arrangements that the Job Corps currently receives. If vocational education is to serve the disadvantaged, Federal funds should be made available at a level commensurate to that given to other programs for these groups.

7. The level of funding for the training programs must be raised substantially if these activities are to make visible inroads into the problems they seek to remedy. The present level of funding is inadequate to provide meaningful training for many of those currently enrolled in programs, let alone the vast numbers whom the programs should be serving.

Many of the problems that plague the administration of training programs and often result in their inefficient operation stem from an abysmal lack of funds. The moneys appropriated for training programs make it possible to meet the needs of only a small portion of the unemployed and the underemployed. Trainable persons outside of the labor force are for the most part ignored, as are most of the underemployed persons. Nor are there adequate funds to train persons for some of the skilled jobs that are now vacant.

The most optimistic estimate asserts that only a very small fraction of the persons who need training in a manpower or related program can be enrolled in one. All the job training programs combined meet only a miniscule part of the needs of the Nation's local communities. And even if the programs operated at a maximum level of efficiency and coordination, they would still amount to only a most modest effort.

The national manpower training effort seems to be doing its best to make a dime do a dollar's work. There is no efficient, practical way that this can be done. As a result, Federal administrators are forced to reshuffle funds from one needy area to another. Strategems are devised that will put the money where it is most needed, even if it means cutting off funds completely from areas that also have justifiable needs.

There is not enough money yet available to meet the needs of hundreds of thousands of hard-core unemployed. There is not enough available for remedial education and the supportive services and post-training follow-up which are vital to an efficient manpower program. There is not enough available to staff and evaluate projects so that efficient operations are assured. There is not enough available for the ghettos, the rural areas, and special economically disadvantaged areas. There is simply not enough money to do an even half-way adequate job.

There are, of course, economies of scale in manpower training as in anything else. But if the manpower program is destined to suffer from a severe and chronic shortage of funds, then it will continue to be nothing more than a program that operates on an experimental and demonstration basis. Any expectations for significantly increased efficiency without additional funds should be forgotten.

The Committee's recommendation is consistent with the high ordering given to the subject matter by the President. In his first message to Congress in 1968, he announced plans for a major effort to help 500,000 hard-core unemployed. Manpower programs are to be the mainstay. An increase in funding levels was requested along with a major re-shuffling of existing funds between programs. These actions are indicative of the current primacy assigned to manpower programs and further emphasize the need for statutory guidance and commitment.

8. The current congressional practice of funding programs months after the beginning of the fiscal year is the most pervasive source of inefficiency in the present administration of training programs and should be changed to permit reasonable time for programing operations.

   The requirement that all funds be obligated by the end of the fiscal year, under these circumstances, is unrealistic. The period of obligation should be made longer than twelve months.

Where the Committee encountered serious waste in the administration of training programs, it often could be traced to the Congressional funding cycle, a process that severely handicaps the effectiveness of the entire manpower system.

Appropriations often are not made until months after the fiscal year has begun. Until then, government agencies are forced to operate on the basis of continuing resolutions which allow them to spend at the level of the preceding fiscal year.

When the new budget is finally approved, the new amount must be completely obligated in the remaining months of the fiscal year. The result of these delays is that new projects are held in abeyance, the future of old projects is kept in doubt, and plans to expand successful projects are postponed.

Staff recruitment for new and expanded programs also suffers since, where instructors are involved, the traditional hiring month is March (the time when public school contracts -- one of the chief competitors -- are consummated). Similarly, the uncertainty makes it more difficult to retain staffs in old programs. Tenure is not available in these positions and without guarantees of continued employment the staffs are often lured away to more stable employment positions.

But not only does the funding process have a deleterious effect on personnel, it also affects the courses that are offered and the assignment of facilities and equipment. Moreover, the effect on the trainees themselves should not be overlooked. The postponement of classes because of a lack of funds often means that recruits have drifted away by the time the classes finally begin and the entire recruiting process must be started all over again.

Patience is seldom an attribute of the disadvantaged--nor is sympathetic understanding about the reasons for delays in funding. Congress, which may be able to justify the slowness of the appropriation process, does not have to explain to local groups the reasons why a project is delayed. Nor do the members of Congress have to witness their well-conceived programs wither away because staff members resign in search of more security. This problem of funding is foremost in the minds of governors, mayors, and manpower project officials. It has made them angry, and often bitter. *No other problem was mentioned more often or more vociferously by the governors, the mayors, and the project officials with whom the Committee had contact*.

As matters now stand, the requirement that all funds be obligated by the June 30 of the fiscal year is totally unrealistic. The terminal requirement must be made flexible. The significant consideration should be *how* money is spent and not *when*. State and local officials now endure long periods of delay before they are informed of the availability of their funds. It is essential that more time be given these officials so that they can implement their planned projects in an orderly and efficient fashion.

The one-year funding causes serious problems in almost every project. Frequently, projects were found to be on a seemingly endless treadmill. Administrators filed applications for the next fiscal year before they received funding for the current fiscal year. Program and project administrators complained constantly and heatedly that the one year funding cycle, because of uncertain Congressional support, made a mockery of planning. Staff could not be assembled, trainees could not be enrolled, and inefficiency was inevitable.

Dividends in program efficiency would accrue at every level of operation if the project funding period were extended for two years. A related change, which does not require legislative action, would be to place more faith in "demonstrated past performance" as an acceptable criterion for the re-funding of on-going projects.

The Committee is well aware that Congress has recognized the nature of these problems. In the 1967 report of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, special note was made of the damage inflicted on education programs by delayed appropriations. In that report, the Subcommittee recommended that: (1) all authorizations should extend for a period of not less than two years and should be renewed, amended, or terminated one full year prior to their expiration dates: (2) Congress should make every effort to appropriate funds by May 1 of the calendar year; (3) all authorizations for new programs, or major changes in existing ones, should allow a full year and provide sufficient funds for adequate planning at all levels of administration before they become effective;

and (4) a joint House-Senate study should be conducted of alternative methods to alleviate the problem of late funding (e.g., considering the possibility of appropriating funds one year in advance of present procedure).

9. Funding procedures and delegations of approval authority should be studied to identify and eliminate non-essential reviews and other causes of unnecessary delay. An effort should be made to modify the course-by-course funding procedures of skill centers.

The limited resources of the manpower programs naturally put a premium on using them most effectively and for purposes considered to be of highest priority. Mis-directed care and zeal in husbanding funds, however, may account for some of the difficulties and delays reported by local and state program officials.

Experienced bureaucrats, as well as newly-appointed project administrators, universally report exhaustion and bafflement in their attempt to fight their way through the review and approval procedures at local, state, and Federal levels. Waste and inefficiency is clearly represented in the time and energy expended in the process of funding local projects. It is especially wasteful in view of severely limited staff resources and the disaster that can overtake a program whose beginning is delayed because of an absence of funds.

One example of where special attention is needed is in the case of the Multi-Skill or Multi-Occupational Center. These Centers are being used increasingly for MDTA training. They are subject to the funding procedure which was devised for programming individual, one-at-a-time courses. It is anachronistic, wasteful, and inefficient to require course-by-course approval for a training facility that has been set up for the express purpose of operating continuously for the sake of efficiency.

A careful concentration on the subject of funding procedures is urgently required. It does not call for any new capability. Within the existing administrative structure in Washington there are already inter-bureau and inter-agency committees which can take a hard look at the present procedures, rationalize them, and most important, simplify them. Federal administrators are well aware of this problem and have already instituted some changes. The pending bill, H.R. 12631 (the "Joint Funding Simplification Act"), appears to be a step in the right direction. However, attention must be given to programs that are administered by only one agency. Efforts in this direction should be greatly accelerated and extended. Legislative proposals for removal of any legal obstacles to simplification of the funding procedures should be submitted as needed.

10. In communities where training programs are planned and funded on a comprehensive basis, at least ten percent of the funding allocated should be available to the prime sponsor for use on a flexible basis.

Responsiveness is an important element in manpower training programs. When trainees are available, training slots should also be available. When the local job market calls for certain occupational skills, those skills should be the training program's focus. Too often, however, the projects in local communities are unable to respond quickly to unforseen contingencies. The local administrators are strapped to the rigid terms of the original project contract. State and local plans should provide some small measure of flexibility. The Committee recommends that at least ten percent of the funding allocated to prime sponsors in a community should be made available on a flexible basis.

This modest flexibility in the use of funds is indispensable in a dynamic program, and appropriate in a comprehensively planned one. The flexibility would not "open-end" programs to the point of jeopardizing their original design.

The Committee is convinced that provision for even a small bit of flexibility would avoid much of the waste and inefficiency that is inflicted by the present rigidity which has been built into the system.

11. Proposals to consolidate the administration of all of the many current training programs into one single Federal agency -- presently existing or to be established -- are inappropriate at this time. Some years hence such a step may well be advantageous. Now, while rapid innovations in program content are occurring, new target clientele being designated, and various administrative lines of authority being tested, it appears preferable to focus the expertise of the specialized Federal agencies on distinguishable tasks, and to observe the results. However, efforts should be made now to integrate existing activities within the Department of Labor, where the programs today are concentrated, into a smaller number of general program offerings.

The Committee considered long and carefully proposals to consolidate all manpower programs into a single new Federal agency of cabinet level, responsible generally for Federal education and training programs. The Committee did not find such proposals sufficiently well developed to justify such a major government-wide reorganization at this time. It recommends a continuation of the present general framework.

The Committee does not find answers in the consolidation proposals to certain basic questions. For example, how would the establishment of a single new Federal agency in Washington, D. C., improve the coordination of manpower programs at State and local levels? As President Johnson stated in his January 23, 1968, Message to Congress: "The central fact about all our manpower programs is that they are local in nature." The local agencies administering the programs are numerous, and they do not fit an identical pattern. Federal support for their projects come to some of them directly and to some of them through State agencies. The pattern of State agencies also varies. The proposal for a new Washington agency would presumably place the Federal funds in a single pool, but the outflow of these funds to the action level would continue to involve diverse systems of proposals, reviews, and approvals. The establishment of a new Washington agency seems to offer no guarantee of a better answer to potential waste, duplication, and inefficiency in actual program implementation.

Nor does the Committee find that consolidation proposals have dealt with the implications for Federal educational programs. More than a score of Federal departments and agencies and more than $12 billion are estimated to be involved in the total educational effort. Further analysis is needed to determine whether all this effort or what part of it should be joined with the $2.1 billion manpower effort in creating a new agency.

The most frequent aim expressed in advocacy of consolidation is the elimination of duplication and overlap. But concern with duplication of effort in training programs can be over-zealous. If the Nation's disadvantaged are to be offered a range of training choices, then duplication may be advantageous. No individual should be assigned to a training project simply because it is the only one in town with a vacancy. A trainee should be afforded an opportunity to choose training which suits his capabilities and aspirations best, subject to the basic requirement of market demand.

Similarly, duplication of effort may actually represent a beneficial situation of multiple resources for local program agencies eager to establish innovative and pioneering projects. The Committee does not wish to gloss over the potential problems of waste and the need for coordination but it believes that a precipitous effort now of massive consolidation of programs would tend to be a simplistic solution.

The Committee notes, moreover, the current developments that seem to be moving toward improved coordination and selective consolidation. It endorses the recent trend in program delegation agreements between agencies; the creation of the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System; the implementation of the Concentrated Employment Program; and the consolidation of the Title IB programs of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendment of 1967. All of these -- in principle -- represent significant strides toward correction of demonstrated past shortcomings. The trick is to find ways to preserve the beneficial aspects of duplication while simultaneously weeding out the wasteful aspects.

The elements of the Nation's manpower system are now being formed. This is a period of development and experimentation. Individual agencies with different resources, different program histories, and different clientele orientations are seeking the most effective manpower program design to solve training problems. From their diverse efforts much is still to be learned.

When sufficient funds are available, and when today's experiments are tested and refined, the proposal for a single agency will be more relevant and more important.

In summary, it is clear to the Committee that the recommendation for a single agency as the sole answer needs far more review before it can be realistically proposed. Yet it is equally clear that the idea should not be discarded. Further study and analysis are called for. The task should be carried out by persons thoroughly competent in the operation of the Federal government and state and local governments and knowledgeable in the manpower and related programs. The Committee suggests that the task could be best performed under the direction of an institute or foundation with experience in such studies, or by a university school of public administration.

12. Comprehensive planning at the community level should be expanded, and funds should be provided for strengthening the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System.

The recent amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act represent significant forward movement toward reduction of waste, duplication, and inefficiency. They should facilitate comprehensive community planning and coordination.

The Committee had previously felt concern over the number of discrete programs under Title IB of the Act and the dispersion of responsibility that could occur. Consolidation of most of these will now be effected, without loss of flexibility. The emphasis on funding through a prime sponsor and the establishment of the Concentrated Employment Program are part of this same general movement.

Given the availability of multiple program resources and the involvement of numerous agencies in administration and support of manpower projects, the need for comprehensive community planning is self-evident.

The lack of advance planning and the fragmentation of training efforts at the local level are common problems in almost every community. In the absence of planning, it is not unusual that projects are established which do not attack the priority manpower problems of the local population. Nor is it unusual that there are no complementary programs to follow up an original training experience.

Comprehensive planning, both immediate and long range, is needed to develop programs to meet existing and projected needs. It is also needed to develop sequential linkages among programs. Such planning will permit a rational decision on what priorities should be assigned the various needs in a given community. Planning will also facilitate funding an overall training effort in a locality -- not just a series of unrelated fragments.

The acute problems of large urban areas particularly require comprehensive planning based on functional geographic lines, for such areas encompass one or more cities within one State or they may even cross State boundaries.

In recent legislation, Congress has provided for comprehensive planning grants in Health Services and in the Model Cities program. These two programs demonstrate innovative funding patterns for Federal grants. They provide a logical framework for the achievement of lateral coordination of federally assisted training activities at each of these levels.

The challenges to successful coordination of manpower programs are -- to say the least -- formidable. There are eleven regions, fifty States, and several hundred local communities with a Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System committee. Each of these has a special environment, unique problems, and varied program needs. Uniform guidelines that are both flexible and consistent are not easy to construct.

The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System is an inter-agency planning arrangement. Yet planning that is chiefly dependent on local cooperation is no assurance per se that the plans will actually be implemented. A Presidential Executive Order, or an administrative directive by each of the involved agencies, which stipulates compliance with agreed upon Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System plans would seem to be a minimum requirement.

Each Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System committee should be given funds to set up a permanent staff. The size of the staff should vary according to the level of program activities in the area. Effective planning can be no better than its informational support. A full-time staff could provide the necessary back-up material needed to authenticate program proposals and to evaluate actual program performance.

The need for a strong local coordinating agency is apparent. It is at the local community level that the program services are delivered and it is there that the clientele reside. And it is at the local community level that the greatest coordination vacuum exists. The public school system, the local branch of the employment service, the county welfare board, and the community action agency often act in a completely autonomous manner. The local Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System body represents a major stride toward the attainment of a cooperative relationship between these separate organizations.

13. Because discrimination in hiring and upgrading influences adversely the opportunities for minorities to participate in training programs for jobs of higher skills, every applicable law designed to prohibit discriminatory practices must be more aggressively enforced. Agencies involved in administering training programs must strengthen their ability to monitor these programs in order to eliminate discriminatory practices.

During its investigations the Committee frequently heard accusations concerning the denial of equal opportunity in connection with the Nation's manpower programs. These charges were not limited to any single section of the Nation. They were made in New York as well as in New Orleans, in New Haven as well as in Oakland.

The charges varied. Some accused local communities with having failed to use available programs for certain disadvantaged groups. In other instances, it was charged that local sponsors discriminated against minority groups by barring them from admission to local projects. Another complaint was that access to training programs was virtually denied to some because the programs were not oriented to the needs of minority groups.

The most frequent complaint, however, was that no meaningful jobs await the members of minority groups once they complete their training.

Equal employment opportunity is essential to the success of manpower development programs. Without it, any attempt to develop the maximum potential of the country's human resources will be to little avail, and discrimination is, therefore, clear evidence of waste in any training system. It is the Committee's view that the problem cannot be adequately dealt with simply by a policy of non-discrimination in admission to training programs, however vigorously enforced. What is needed are programs to assure that, in all phases of the employment process, there will be equal opportunity, because it is the discrimination in hiring and upgrading which backs up into the operation of the training programs, and leads to discriminatory practices there as well.

Responsibility to oversee the dovetailing of manpower and equal employment policies should be assigned to a designated official in the Manpower Administration. The position should be at a level of authority commensurate with the high priority of the issue.

When similar complaints of discrimination were made against certain programs in the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary established the Department's Civil Rights Committee. In 1963, the Secretary of Labor also created an Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training, which has concerned itself primarily with equal opportunity in apprenticeship. It seems evident that either this Committee's mandate should be expanded and its membership altered, or another group should be created as a forum for discussion of discriminatory practices in the wider arena of all training. Such a representative group could not only provide guidance for program development, but it could also serve to receive general complaints from groups who wish to express their dissatisfaction with present training efforts.

The community, of course, remains the key area. And it may be necessary to develop an administrative structure that combines a knowledge of the training programs with a full understanding of equal employment goals and community relations. Representatives stationed in the communities but reporting directly to the Manpower Administrator or his designee would be able to investigate complaints, initiate studies, seek to eliminate or nullify discriminating attitudes, and report directly to Washington any digression by local agencies and groups from the national program's goals. The representatives would not have enforcement authority nor would they duplicate existing fair employment practice bodies.

The Nation now has a battery of anti-discrimination laws and related enforcement agencies. The close interrelationship between the goals of equal employment opportunity and of manpower programs makes it imperative that those government agencies -- Federal, State, and local -- involved in the enforcement of civil rights laws pay special attention to discrimination charges in the training area. Barriers to effective training and to placement in jobs for which individuals have been trained prevent individuals from attaining adequate income levels. And the attainment of adequate income is essential to give full meaning to progress represented by access to better housing, education, and travel accommodations and eating places. Hence, the Committee urges the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and its counterparts in the States and local communities to place the issue of discrimination in training at the top of its action list.

14. The quality of personnel and the performance capabilities of the State Employment Services should be improved. General revenue funds should be used to supplement the employer payroll taxes as a source of financial support. If recognition in the form of demonstrated actions by the states as to the vital responsibilities incumbent upon these services in the achievement of national manpower goals is not forthcoming, consideration should be given to the substitution of a Federal Employment Service for the present arrangement.

For most of its history, the public employment service operated as a labor exchange agency. Employers placed notices of job openings on file and job seekers made known their availability. But with the multiplication of manpower programs in the sixties, the Employment Service has become involved in the search for solutions to the Nation's employment problems. In fact, the State Employment Services are emerging as the central manpower agencies in the local communities of the Nation. In almost all the manpower programs, the major responsibility for recruitment, counseling, testing, job development, placement, and follow-up has been assigned to this agency. Results have varied among the states, but for the most part, there is widespread criticism of the performance of these duties. Dissatisfaction was expressed to the Committee regarding numerous aspects: failure to cooperate with other Federal agencies; insincerity in the pursuit of program goals; intransigency to new ideas; indifference to minority employment needs; failure to develop adequate out-reach programs; poor staffing; incompetent administration; and constraints imposed by an administrative structure patterned according to political boundaries rather than labor markets.

The public employment service is operated on the basis of a Federal-State partnership. Although funded almost entirely by a Federal tax on employer payrolls, each State provides the administrative structure, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, that operates within its boundaries. The personnel, however, are all State employees (except in Washington, D. C.) and are hired, classified, and paid by State civil service standards subject to the approval of the U.S. Department of Labor. Needless to say, there is wide disparity among the States with regard to these matters. Salary and qualification levels are required to be comparable to those of other State agencies. Hiring and retaining competent staff to perform vital tasks have become serious problems.

There is mounting concern that the present funding source is approaching the exhaustion point. The four tenths of a percent tax on the first $3,000 of covered employer payrolls represents a relatively static funding source. Under such a funding constraint, the growing need for increasingly complex services can only result in a deterioration in the quality of delivered service. To a limited degree, some general revenue funds are available -- as "selection and referral" money for MDTA and Job Corps -- but they are insufficient to cover the total expenditure of time and effort. In addition, some funds come from service contracts, as with the Concentrated Employment Program or the Work Incentive Program now being established. Nevertheless, the public employment service is insufficiently funded to perform the range and quality of manpower services that are its responsibility.

Therefore, the Committee recommends that general revenue funds be made available to enable the public employment service to carry out its mission.

But more money alone is not the sole answer. Within most States, it is necessary to change administrative structures, induce greater efficiency, and -- most important of all -- raise salaries for high quality personnel recruitment purposes. To accomplish these goals, the Committee believes that it is mandatory that Federal supervision of the individual State Employment Services be increased.

Today, it is possible for the Secretary of Labor to declare that a State's Unemployment Insurance Program is "out of conformity." Such a determination involves certain penalty sanctions. At present, however, the Secretary does not possess similar powers over the employment service functions of each State. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the Secretary be empowered to declare a State's employment service program to be "out of conformity." In such an instance, the Secretary could not only withhold all funds from a State's employment service as he is now empowered to do; he could also federalize the employment service functions of the State without simultaneously federalizing the same State's Unemployment Insurance Program. The fact that the two functions can be separated in such a manner has already been demonstrated by the experience of the Nation in World War II when the employment service was federalized but the States retained control over the Unemployment Insurance Program.

In addition, the Committee recommends that the Secretary of Labor be empowered to selectively withhold funds for individual programs within a State's employment service without interruption of other programs where standards are being met.

With these additional powers, it is hoped that the Secretary can prod the individual States to improve their employment service operations.

If the response is not satisfactory, then the Committee concludes that the importance of the issue dictates that a Federal employment service be established in the place of the present system.

15. To the extent feasible, the regional boundaries and headquarter cities of the several Federal agencies which are engaged in manpower programs should be made congruent.

The administration and coordination of training programs is complicated by the variations in regional boundaries and by the different locations of regional offices of the Federal agencies involved.

The diversity in geographic areas served by the Federal agencies causes problems in administrative relationships within and among agencies. These problems often interfere with attempts at integrated planning of manpower-related programs for a region. A meeting to discuss a particular program in one region can necessitate calling regional representatives in several different cities, each concerned with substantially different areas because of overlapping jurisdictions for one or more States.

Potential sponsors of training programs frequently find that they must contact agencies in different cities and different regions. For example, to obtain approval for an MDTA-Institutional project in Minneapolis by going through State channels, Minnesota would contact the regional office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Kansas City (which handles the Midwestern Plains States) for approval of institutional training. It would also need Department of Labor assent from the Bureau of Employment Security's Chicago Office (which is responsible for the Great Lakes complex of States). Programs involving coordination or approval by a larger number of agencies, such as Title V-Work Experience Programs, would require transactions with a still larger and more widely dispersed group of regional offices.

The multiplicity of regions does not present simply a geographic or logistical problem to the would-be sponsor. Because any one State may be located in two or more very different groupings of States, it is possible that the chief concerns and priorities may vary in the different regional headquarters. A sponsor may have to deal in one agency with a regional office oriented toward an array of primarily agricultural States, while the responsible regional office of another agency may be concerned with a complex of largely industrialized and urbanized States.

The problem of administrative complexities resulting from regional variations encompasses more than the manpower agencies. The general problem has been under study by the Federal government at least since 1946. A study concluded in 1967 by the Bureau of the Budget, responding to the President's message on "The Quality of Government," may produce some changes in 1968. Realignment of regional boundaries cannot be accomplished easily or arbitrarily. In many instances, regional patterns may be based on truly functional considerations. Others, however, may have been determined for more capricious reasons or for historic conveniences, the logic of which no longer applies. It is necessary that the agencies' regions be reconstituted according to the criterion of the most rational administrative structure for the performance of agencies' functions and the implementation of national policy.

If it is determined that completely uniform regional boundaries for agencies involved in manpower programs are not feasible, because of functional requirements of a given Department's broader responsibilities, then other measures short of complete reconciliation should be adopted. These should include as a minimum the designation of uniform regional headquarters cities.

16. Internal program communications and inter-program communications must be improved. Neither the individuals who are potential trainees, nor the local officials or leaders in the communities in which they reside, nor the state administrators of pertinent agencies, nor even numerous involved Federal officials, appear to comprehend the scope, the distribution, the diversity, the applicability, or the limitations of the multitude of training programs now in operation. Information for trainees should be made available in neighborhood centers on a "one-stop" basis.

Too many of the manpower training programs are too little known by too many people in too many parts of the country. In letters received by the Committee from mayors, there were confessions of complete unawareness of the programs that the city officials had been queried about. In staff interviews, some of the local spokesmen owned up to the fact that they did not know the difference between the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps and were completely uninformed about how to get persons into either.

Many program administrators are ignorant of programs that are outside their jurisdiction. And some are not even fully informed of the requirements and procedures in the very programs that they administer. Persons in local government and in the community, who could serve as catalysts by bringing the resources of the Federal programs to their locality, are often unaware of what is available, or too baffled to engineer its delivery. The disadvantaged and the other persons whom the training programs are intended to serve usually do not know what is available in their community and rarely find out where to go and how to apply for programs best suited for them.

It is through no fault of their own that administrators, potential sponsors, and would-be trainees lack information about and understanding of the Federal manpower training effort. It is an incredibly complicated, ever-changing structure and there are few summaries available.

It is not necessary to churn out a new torrent of documents to achieve a proper information flow for the manpower programs. What is needed is an exchange of information within the government in the simplest possible form of communication. This should not require a new committee; several already in existence could provide the necessary channels.

A simplified, dependable flow of information to the field would be of immeasurable benefit.

Potential trainees should be able to get all the information they need from a one-stop neighborhood information center. "Outreach" (person-to-person) efforts may be effectively used to recruit trainees in bars and pool halls and on street corners.

It is also suggested that the traditional information channels (i.e., employment service offices, neighborhood service centers, post offices, public schools, and welfare offices) be supplemented by the distribution of relevant information in churches and fraternal halls, commercial establishments, and recreation and community centers.

17. Because data on program performance and trainee status, characteristics, and accomplishments are limited or unavailable to the degree that meaningful evaluation of the benefits and costs of these activities appears precluded, a comprehensive and expeditious system of data collection must be put into being immediately. Report requirements for all programs should be made comparable, and conciseness stressed. Results should be made available for objective study and evaluation.

The meagerness of the present evaluation effort is widely acknowledged. It is conceded to be a serious weakness, and the need for the extensive and critical evaluation of training programs is expressed at all levels.

This weakness must be corrected for intelligent planning and program improvement to occur. Unfortunately, the Committee found that this sense of urgency is not sufficiently shared by many program administrators. In the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity attention is being given to the numbers of individuals participating and the quantity of dollars expended on a current basis. But far too little concern is demonstrated about what becomes of the trainees once they finish their training. Moreover, it is virtually impossible to identify dropouts for descriptive or analytical purposes. Nor has the Committee seen adequate efforts to relate program expenditures to the benefits received by trainees.

As matters now stand, most programs lack a reporting system that is capable of generating the data needed for proper evaluation. Too little attention has been paid to making sure that the information reported is complete and consistent.

The present tendency is to gather whatever data are obtained and to put them in a file. Inadequate staff is available to retrieve and to evaluate the results. Outside researchers find that access to the file of information is all but impossible.

Then, too, there remains the very serious issue as to who should conduct the needed evaluations. The ability of agencies to evaluate their own programs in an impartial manner is open to serious question. Outside contractors, if they can obtain access to the data, are potentially a better body to conduct such investigations, but their work may not be aggressively objective. The tendency, unfortunately, is to recommend improvements but not to be highly critical.

The Bureau of the Budget is in a strategic position to compare program accomplishments but it is limited in staff size, hampered by the lack of sufficient data, and unfortunately can be pressured by inter-agency politics.

Thus, it would seem important that some evaluations be conducted by university, foundation, and other personnel independent of governmental ties. However, each agency and department should continue to make evaluations of its programs, which now suffer from under-evaluation at best and, too frequently, from no evaluation at all.

A prerequisite to proper evaluation, of course, is the establishment of a consistent and comprehensive reporting system. Despite a plethora of forms, little useful information has been gathered in a meaningful manner. All projects maintain records as required by their funding agency, but every agency has different reporting requirements. These variations thwart inter-program comparisons because different bases, definitions, and time periods are used from program to program.

18. More use should be made of jointly supported projects and of program linkages. Existing procedures for joint conduct or funding of training efforts in local communities using components from the several independent programs are now so troublesome that program sponsors commonly avoid their use out of exasperation. These procedures must be restructured, and then reinforced by cross funding allocations. In particular, first, an appropriate portion of MDTA funds should be reserved at the community level for enrollees cycled through from lower-skill work and training programs. Inequitable income payment systems that hamper trainee mobility between programs should be eliminated.

    Second, at least 50 percent of the funds awarded each state for Adult Basic Education under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should be reserved for use in community training projects which couple basic education with job training or work experience.

    Third, a portion of the funds for vocational rehabilitation should be earmarked by the Rehabilitation Services Administration for use in manpower training efforts.

The need for sequential links in training programs and for an array of supportive services is obvious. But neither will be fully achieved until there is better program coordination. And better program coordination depends on an efficient, quick system that will make cross-funding simpler and easier.

In many localities resources are wasted because programs whose effectiveness could have been improved through joint operations were instead operating alone and inefficiently. One example is in Oakland where the East Bay Skills Center was so starved for funds for adult basic education that it had to retreat from its original plan to provide basic education for persons below the fifth-grade literacy level. At the same time adult basic education programs were available to a limited extent in the Oakland school system. They were funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This program presumably was serving persons in need of literacy training. But it did not reach persons who needed remedial education to assist their employability.

Because cross-funding is so difficult, most program administrators do not even attempt it. The more valiant ones are inspired by the possibilities of joining meager resources for more effective returns, but they are rarely able to overcome the obstacles.

The Concentrated Employment Program represents, in a sense, the triumph of cross-funding. The Concentrated Employment Program does bring together funds from six different program sources for concentrated use. It is able to do so by dint of the special skills and expertise of the Manpower Administration representatives who carry on all the intricate negotiations and maneuvers which cross-funding now requires.

The effectiveness of the Concentrated Employment Program could be further enhanced by making the cross-funding procedure easier. Hopefully, such facilitation could be extensive enough to bring the benefits of cross-funding to areas not yet reached by the Concentrated Employment Program.

There is also need to improve linkages between existing programs. Too often a rational sequence of training programs is a rarity in local communities. The creation of a sequence hinges upon statutory changes for some details, but to a considerable extent it is within the capability of the existing administrative structure. The existing nonsequential nature of training programs is wasteful and inefficient.

Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees, for example, frequently "graduate" from Neighborhood Youth Corps into nothingness. The out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps is too often an income maintenance operation that at best requires only some simple useful work. Rarely is it a meaningful training program. The result is that graduates from the Neighborhood Youth Corps are often unable to find permanent employment in adequate jobs. The youth who do not return to school need additional job training, but rarely are they placed in higher-level training programs such as MDTA. The East Bay Skills Center in Oakland, for example, is one of the few MDTA programs which reserves slots for Neighborhood Youth Corps graduates; but only 25 slots are reserved for the community's nearly 2,000 Neighborhood Youth Corps members.

Graduation from lower-skill training programs could be a significant step in advancing a person's employability, if the channels were opened so that he could immediately move into a higher-skill training program. This requires the kind of slot reservation in MDTA that is recommended here, plus the channels of coordination and information that are recommended elsewhere in this report.

One possible block in the path of developing a system of promotion for graduates of lower-skill training programs, or encouraging mobility of trainees among programs generally, is the pattern of income payments for trainees. Different programs may have stipends, allowances, or wage payments. Some of these are determined by the state unemployment compensation rate, some by prevailing wage or minimum wage rate, and some are specified in law. Close attention needs to be given to determine whether this general pattern contains situations in which trainees turn down an otherwise desirable training opportunity because of less advantageous income provision. Flexible and coordinated utilization of training resources requires that unnecessary and artificial barriers to mobility be eliminated wherever found.

Another compelling problem in the training area today is the need to provide basic education for present and potential enrollees. The failure to meet this need -- by failing to combine resources from Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, with resources from the various job training programs -- constitutes both waste and inefficiency.

Remedial education is frequently required for the disadvantaged, to: (1) qualify them for admission into training programs, (2) equip them to comprehend and complete the training sequence, and (3) enable them to benefit fully from the training offered. Program administrators recognize that completion of a work experience program or job training course cannot greatly enhance an enrollee's employability if his educational deficiencies are not remedied at the same time. Job placement, especially in permanent or adequate employment, is very difficult for trainees who lack basic education skills. At the same time, and in the same cities, many sponsors of adult basic education programs were expressing concern with the peripheral nature of their programs, and the apparent lack of connection between the education offered in their classrooms and the enrollees' workaday lives.

The very same groups and individuals in the inner-city areas, who vigorously insisted on the need for basic education offerings, were equally emphatic in explaining why disadvantaged persons turned their backs on conventional classroom programs. They mentioned as reasons: school locations were inconvenient, or were considered uncongenial for adults; curricula were too remote from their needs or experiences; teachers did not work symphathetically with disadvantaged adults, or skillfully with non-English-speaking persons; poor people did not have child-care facilities to free them for school attendance, and/or could not afford to participate in classes that offer no stipend.

It appears that there is little coordination between manpower programs and adult basic education programs funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Administrators of manpower programs generally seemed unaware of the existence of these Adult Basic Education programs that are operated on entirely separate tracks.

2

Since Adult Basic Education is supposed to be directed to persons with severe educational handicaps, much of the target population overlaps with that of the training programs. And since neither program is sufficient to serve this population without the services of the other, definite linkage is clearly desirable.

What is needed and what is recommended is a direct linkage of resources from both Adult Basic Education and the training programs. This would take the form of earmarking a substantial portion of Adult Basic Education funds for use in training programs so that adult basic education can be combined with skill training and work experience.

The expertise of the Office of Education, as well as its financial resources, should be used in the joined programs. In fact, the Office of Education's role would probably be enlarged, commensurate with the increase of its financial support for training programs.

The recommended joining would strengthen training programs by lessening the high dropout rate and improving the placement potential. Similarly, Adult Basic Education programs would overcome the disadvantage they have suffered in trying to involve the poor in a program that offers no stipend and which seems to have no visible connection with employment or income advancement.

Efficiency does not require that all Adult Basic Education funds be coupled with funds for training programs. In some cases basic education alone suffices to qualify an individual for suitable employment. The best example of this may be the Adult Basic Education programs for Cuban refugees. In other cases the end goal of basic education may not be regular employment although in a substantial number of cases the target populations for Adult Basic Education and job training do coincide.

As for vocational rehabilitation as a part of the manpower constellation, it has traditionally organized a complete rehabilitation program for its clients. It is comprehensive in its offerings, but is essentially directed to the physically and mentally handicapped.

It does, however, share the concern of all other training programs for the economically and socially disadvantaged. In fact, a high percentage of the Rehabilitation Services Administration's physically and mentally handicapped clients are also economically and socially disadvantaged. Vocational rehabilitation was undoubtedly assisting the "disadvantaged" long before its administrative regulations were changed in 1965 to extend eligibility to the culturally handicapped. Rehabilitation agency administrators, however, are often not oriented to working with disadvantaged persons who do not have physical or mental handicaps, despite the administrative enlargement of its mandate.

Rehabilitation agencies have tended to keep their operations separate from the job training programs in local communities for several reasons, which include the already mentioned limited financial resources and the self-contained nature of its program. Additionally, rehabilitation has a long-established administrative structure within the State governmental apparatus. Its contacts with other programs are infrequent, particularly those based outside of State administrative lines.

Currently, with the aid of Federal grants, all States are engaged in statewide planning to extend rehabilitation services and to improve their effectiveness. The Committee hopes that one result of such planning will be more effective communication and coordination with all programs concerned with manpower training.

The Committee recommends that a portion of rehabilitation funds be earmarked for use in conjunction with comprehensive work and training programs. The job training complex, in turn, could benefit from exposure to the "client-oriented" approach which is the hallmark of rehabilitation. Indeed, its approach is considered by many as the best prototype to be found.

19. A substantial amount of funds authorized under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 should be earmarked for persons with "special needs" as defined in that Act, and used by the vocational education system in conjunction with community comprehensive work and training programs for youth and adults. In addition to in-school vocational education programs, out-reach programs aimed at youth outside the school system should be developed and should include cooperative programs (i.e., institutional training plus part-time training-related employment).

One of the purposes for which grants are provided by the Federal Government to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is to finance programs to deal with "special needs" of persons who are not able to follow a regular vocational education curriculum because of socio-economic, educational, or other disadvantages.

The mandate of the Act of 1963 to serve these disadvantaged persons is clear. The pace at which such programs are being implemented leaves much to be desired. In 1966 only 1.1 percent of vocational education funds were used for the "special needs" category. In 1968 this is estimated to be 3.7 percent. The need for more imaginative and stronger leadership from the Federal Government is clear.

Moreover, there is insufficient direct relationship between vocational education and remedial manpower programs. Few of the adult vocational education offerings are appropriate to the training needs of the disadvantaged, and some of the programs in home economics and agriculture are not always occupationally oriented.

In most of the cities, fees and/or tuition are charged for adult vocational courses, making enrollment difficult or impossible for the poor. The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System area report for Oakland noted that the city's vocational education slots would serve few, if any, in the hard-core slum areas.

The "special needs" facet of vocational education is primarily directed toward secondary school students with behavioral and learning problems. In Oakland, all "special needs" programs were directed toward mentally or educationally retarded high school youths. In Missouri there were few such programs; they included only one specifically for adults, and one for unwed mothers.

The Committee recommends that the present orientation of the "special needs" funds be changed. A substantial portion of these funds in each State should be earmarked for use in conjunction with comprehensive work and training programs -- especially for out-of-school disadvantaged persons. The programs should be occupationally oriented and become part of a coordinated effort to prepare the disadvantaged for useful employment.

In addition, vocational education schools should make a determined effort "to reclaim" the youths in the community who have dropped out of school. Whatever the reasons for their alienation from institutionalized education, it is wasteful to ignore the possibility that existing vocational education resources may be used in an innovative manner to provide useful occupational training for these youths. Outreach is urged because it is an essential component of any program aimed at the disadvantaged. Programs should be started on a scale commensurate with the need in the local community to operate a system of cooperative education. Under such an arrangement, institutional training is combined with part-time training-related employment. Such a program, it is hoped, would have a greater likelihood of returning "dropouts" to a learning situation.

20. Opportunities for inservice training should be available for the administrators and key personnel of the Manpower Programs at all levels of administation. Specifically, a manpower institute should be established; more extensive use made of available resources of continuing education programs at colleges and universities; and regular face-to-face briefings should be held to inform operating personnel of the findings of research and experimental and demonstration projects.

The shortage of experienced and trained personnel to administer programs is not endemic to the manpower training system. Nor is the pirating of good administrators a unique problem. Expanded activity in the public sector, much of it in new and untested directions, is straining the manpower resources of Federal, State and local governments everywhere. No matter how well-conceived new policies are, they can fail for lack of trained talent. Recognition of this problem underlies the submission to Congress of the Intergovernmental Manpower Act of 1967. Legislation along these lines and the establishment and expansion of direct training programs are needed.

It should be stressed that it is both wasteful and inefficient not to have adequate staff training for manpower personnel. These staff members have frequent, direct contact with program participants, many of whom are so sensitive that they readily confuse staff inexperience or ineptitude with bias or hostility.

Existing procedures for staff training are totally inadequate. The Department of Labor has perhaps the most extensive arrangements for staff training among all the agencies in the manpower field. But even its efforts are sadly limited. For some programs, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Department offers a kind of abbreviated crash training. Furthermore, monthly seminars are sponsored by the Manpower Administration for the personnel of the Department and other agencies. Some quite limited orientation is also provided personnel who work for the Bureau of Employment Security and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Regional staff is included in these orientation sessions. But there is no separate appropriation for training. Its costs are taken from regular appropriations that are intended for salaries and expenses. Personnel in the state employment security agencies are, however, trained with Federal funds. The appropriation for this usually amounts to $150,000 or $200,000 -- although in fiscal 1966 there was a special appropriation of approximately $2.5 million for the training demands made by the Youth Opportunity Centers and the Civil Rights Act.

Inservice training should be an integral part of the manpower program. Training should be held on a short-term basis at a conveniently located facility.

Furthermore, a National Manpower Institute should be established to operate staff training programs, directly, not only in Washington, but also in other selected central locations.

In addition, local and state manpower agencies should rely more heavily upon the community service and continuing education programs of nearly all colleges and universities. Funds provided by Title I of the Higher Education Act could be used to support such undertakings. Such programs should be established in all major labor markets.

Appendixes

Activities of Committee

List of Witnesses and Other Persons Who Attended Committee Meetings

List of Committee, Subcommittee and Staff Site Visits and Special Activities

Table I Summary Listing of Programs*

Table II Program Characteristics*

---

* Tables I and II do not include the Work Incentive Program enacted by the Social Security Amendments of 1967. Although references to aspects of it appear in the Report, the program does not become operational until April 1, 1968.

Table I

Summary Listing of Federally Supported Training Programs

Legislative Authorization	Program	Administering Federal Agency	Federal Funds	
			Fiscal 1967 Allocations	Fiscal 1968 Allocations
Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.				
Title II, B-Section 231	MDTA, Institutional Training	LABOR-BES. HEW-OE-DMDT.	$231,500,000	$210,800,000
Title II, Section 202(j), (1)	MDTA, Part-Time and Other-Than Skill	HEW-OE-DMDT. LABOR-BES.	--	32,328,000
Title II, A-Section 204	On-The-Job Training	LABOR-BAT;[a] LABOR-BES.	25,700,000	33,540,000
Title II, A-Section 204	Coupled-OJT	LABOR-BES; LABOR-BAT.[a] HEW-OE-DMDT.	89,800,000	60,832,000
Title II, C-Section 241	MDTA Training For Redevelopment Area Residents	LABOR-BES; LABOR-BAT.[a] HEW-OE-DMDT. COMMERCE-EDA.	(24,000,000) included in above MDTA funds	(22,000,000) included in above MDTA funds

Table I (continued)

Summary Listing of Federally Supported Training Programs

Legislative Authorization	Program	Administering Federal Agency	Federal Funds Fiscal 1967 Allocations	Federal Funds Fiscal 1968 Allocations
Title II, D-Section 251	MDTA Training - Correctional Institutions	LABOR-BES; LABOR-BAT.[a] HEW-OE-DMDT.	--	--
Title I	Experimental and Demonstration Programs	LABOR-OMPER.[b]	$ 25,295,000	$ 24,219,000
Executive Decision of the President. (Based on MDTA; EOA.)	Ghetto Aid Program	LABOR-MA. COMMERCE-SBA.	N.A.[c]	N.A.
Executive Decision, President's Report to Congress, March 1967. (Based on MDT Act and Economic Opportunity Act)	Concentrated Employment Program (CEP)	LABOR-MA	24,806,000 program support from OEO.	55,000,000 program support from OEO.
Economic Opportunity Act[d] of 1964, as amended to 1966				
Title I, A	Job Corps	OEO-Job Corps	209,155,000	285,000,000
Title I, B	Neighborhood Youth Corps	LABOR-BWTP.	372,395,000	281,000,000[e]
Title I, D	Special Impact Programs	LABOR-BWTP.	--	20,000,000

Table I (continued)

Summary Listing of Federally Supported Training Programs

Legislative Authorization	Program	Administering Federal Agency	Federal Funds Fiscal 1967 Allocations	 Fiscal 1968 Allocations
Title II - Section 205 (d)	Community Employment and Betterment (Operation Mainstream)	LABOR-BWTP.	$ 36,436,000 [f]	$ 44,300,000 [f]
Title II - Section 205 (e)	New Careers	LABOR-BWTP.	35,613,000	27,700,000
Title II - Section 205 (and MDTA - Title II, Parts A and B; PWEDA).	Operation SER - Spanish-American Programs	LABOR-MA OEO-CAP.	200,000	300,000
Title II - Section 205 (a)	Manpower Programs (in Community Action Programs)	OEO-CAP.	13,200,000 (plus 6,800,000 for OIC)	15,000,000 (plus 6,000,000 for OIC)
Title II - Section 205 and 211-3	Adult Basic Education (in Community Action Programs)	OEO-CAP.	18,000,000	17,000,000 [g]
Title II - Section 205	Indian Training Programs	OEO-CAP-SP-Indian Division	N.A.	5,500,000
Title II - Section 207	Research and Demonstration	OEO-CAP-R and D.	4,200,000 [h]	N.A.

Table I (continued)

Summary Listing of Federally Supported Training Programs

Legislative Authorization	Program	Administering Federal Agency	Federal Funds Fiscal 1967 Allocations	Federal Funds Fiscal 1968 Allocations
Title III - Part B - Section 311	Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers	OEO-CAP-SP-Migrant Division.	$ 17,000,000	$ 17,000,000[i]
Title V	Work Experience and Training Programs	HEW-SRS-APA; HEW-OE-DMDT. LABOR-BES; LABOR-BAT;[a] LABOR-BWTP.	99,823,000	45,000,000
Vocational Education Act of 1963. Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. George-Barden Act of 1946.	Vocational Education	HEW-OE-BAVLP.	208,000,000[i]	216,121,000[i]
Vocational Education Act of 1963	Work-Study	HEW-OE-BAVLP.	10,000,000	10,000,000[e]
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended in 1966				
Title III	Adult Basic Education	HEW-OE-BAVLP.	29,200,000	40,250,000

Table I (continued)

Summary Listing of Federally Supported Training Programs

Legislative Authorization	Program	Administering Federal Agency	Federal Funds	
			Fiscal 1967 Allocations	Fiscal 1968 Allocations
Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended				
Chapter 4, Section 31, et seq.	Vocational Rehabilitation	HEW-SRS-RSA.	$ 52,000,000[j]	$ 62,500,000[j]
Social Security Act, as amended 1965				
Title II, Section 222 (d)	Vocational Rehabilitation for Social Security Disability Beneficiaries	HEW-SRS-RSA.	2,200,000	5,200,000[j]
Title IV, Section 409	Community Work and Training (AFDC-UP Recipients)	HEW-SRS-APA.	--	40,000,000[k]
National Apprenticeship Act of 1937	Apprenticeship and Training Program	LABOR-BAT.	8,256,000	8,401,000

Table I (continued)

Summary Listing of Federally Supported Training Programs

Legislative Authorization	Program	Administering Federal Agency	Federal Funds	
			Fiscal 1967 Allocations	Fiscal 1968 Allocations
Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967.				
Title III	Education and Training for Veterans	Veterans Administration.	--	$ 18,300,000 (for OJT component only)
Adult Indian Vocational Training Act, P.L.84,969 as amended. Education and Welfare Services Act.	Adult Education, Vocational Training, and Employment Assistance for American Indians	Interior-BIA.	$ 17,236,000 (for manpower activities only)	21,097,000 (for manpower activities only)
Basic Laws Governing Operation of Bureau of Prisons, Title 18	Educational and Vocational Training for Federal Prisoners	JUSTICE-BOP.	3,400,000[1/]	3,600,000[1/]

---

a/ As of December 19, 1967, the duties of BAT with respect to OJT programs have been transferred to the Bureau of Work-Training Programs (BWTP), which was formerly the BWP.

b/ As of October 23, 1967, OMPER was dissolved and its functions absorbed directly into the Office of the Manpower Administrator.

c/ N.A. means information was not available.

d/ This listing does not take into consideration the changes in training programs affected by the EOA Amendments of 1967. These changes expand Title I, B to include NYC, New Careers, Operation Mainstream, a general work and training program for out-of-school youth and adults, and legislative recognition for the Concentrated Employment Program. All of these would be encompassed in a local community's Comprehensive Work and Training Program. There is an appropriation of $53 million for OEO for Comprehensive Employment activities in Fiscal 1968. Many of the EOA programs are now authorized under different Section numbers.

e/ This excludes the $10 million appropriated in NYC and earmarked for transfer to HEW for conduct of the Vocational Education Work-Study program. This amount is shown here as the Fiscal 1968 allocation for Work-Study.

f/ Includes $10,000,000 for the Foster Grandparent Program.

g/ An estimated amount of the total CAP budget which may be used for ABE programs.

h/ Estimated amount of 1967 R and D funds used in job training programs.

i/ Estimated amount of funds to be expended on adult job training, basic education, and related manpower activities.

j/ Estimated amount of funds to be expended for job training and vocational education. Excludes amounts for other programs and services.

[k] Includes $6.212 million for Day Care and administration services.

[l] Includes an estimated $1.8 million for Fiscal 1967 and $2.0 million for Fiscal 1968 in funds derived from profits on prison industries.

SOURCE: Fiscal data complied from information supplied by Bureau of Budget and agency estimates. Other data derived from legislative and administrative documents and reports.

Table II

Program Characteristics: Training Programs Administered by the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity

Program	Administering Federal Agency	Offerings[a]	Trainee Allowances	Target Population	Program Activities, Fiscal 1967		Fiscal 1968 (Program Goals) Number of Slots	Stipulated State Allotment Formula	Matching Required
					Number of Enrollees	Number of Completions			
1. MDTA, Institutional	LABOR-BES; HEW-OE-DMDT	V*, P, B	Yes	Unemployed, under-employed, low-skilled, disadvantaged, obsolescent-skilled.	162,400[b]	100,100[b]	95,000 (excluding CEP)	Yes	Yes
2. MDTA, Part-time and Other-Than-Skill	LABOR-BES; HEW-OE-DMDT	V, P, B	Yes	Unemployed, under-employed, low-skilled, disadvantaged, obsolescent-skilled.	-0-	-0-	50,000 (excluding CEP)	Yes	Yes
3. MDTA, On-the-Job Training (OJT)	LABOR-BAT;[c] LABOR-BES.	V	Yes	Unemployed, under-employed, low-skilled, disadvantaged, obsolescent-skilled.	75,700[b]	32,100[b]	58,000 (excluding CEP)	Yes	No
4. MDTA, Coupled	LABOR-BES, LABOR-BAT;[c] HEW-OE-DMDT	V*, P, B	Yes	Unemployed, under-employed, low-skilled, disadvantaged, obsolescent-skilled.	22,600[b]	9,600[b]	36,000 (excluding CEP)	Yes	Yes
5. MDTA, Experimental & Demonstration (E and D)	LABOR-OMPER[c]	V, P, B, O	Yes	Hard-to-reach; disadvantaged youth; hard-core unemployed; older workers; minority groups.	D.N.A.[d]	D.N.A.	D.N.A.	No	No
6. MDTA, Training for Redevelopment Area Residents	LABOR-BES, LABOR-BAT;[c] HEW-OE-DMDT; COMMERCE-EDA.	V*, P, B	Yes	Unemployed and under-employed in redevelopment areas.	14,100[b]	8,700[b]	(13,700 included in above MDTA figures)	No	No
7. MDTA, Correctional Institutions	LABOR-BES, LABOR-BAT;[c] HEW-OE-DMDT	V, P, B, O	Yes	Inmates of correctional institutions.	-0-	-0-	(5,000 included in MDTA-Institutional)	No	No

Table II (continued)

Program Characteristics: Training Programs Administered by the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity

Program	Administering Federal Agency	Offerings[a]	Trainee Allowances	Target Population	Program Activities, Fiscal 1967 Number of Enrollees	Program Activities, Fiscal 1967 Number of Completions	Fiscal 1968 (Program Goals) Number of Slots	Stipulated State Allotment Formula	Matching Required
8. Apprenticeship and Training	LABOR-BAT	V	No (receive wages)	General	278,000	28,000	294,000	No	No
9. Ghetto Aid	LABOR-MA	V, P, B, W, O	Depends on source of funds.	Hard-core disadvantaged.	-0-	-0-	N.A.[e]	No	Depends on source of funds.
10. Concentrated Employment Program (CEP)	LABOR-MA	V, P, B, O	Yes, depending on source of funds.	Hard-core unemployed and disadvantaged in selected areas.	-0-[f]	-0-	115,400	No	Depends on source of funds.
11. Operation SER Spanish-American Programs	LABOR-MA OEO-CAP	V, P, B, O*	Yes, depending on source of funds.	Spanish-surname persons of low-income in 11 urban areas in five states which have large Spanish-American populations.	D.N.A.	D.N.A.	N.A.	No	Depends on source of funds.
12. Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC)	LABOR-BWP[c]	W*, P, B, V, O	Yes	In-school youth or[g] dropouts 16-21 yrs. from poverty families.	761,636 in 512,727 slots.	N.A.	321,000 slots for 483,000 enrollees.	Yes[h]	Yes
13. Community Employment and Betterment (CEB, Nelson)	LABOR-BWP[c]	W*, V, O	Yes	Chronically unemployed adults in poverty.[i]	7,968[j]	N.A.	86,700 slots for 130,000 trainees in CEB, NC, SI combined.	Yes[h]	Yes
14. New Careers (Scheuer)	LABOR-BWP[c]	V*, O	Yes	Adults below poverty[i] level.	4,447[j]	N.A.	(12,100 included in above figure)	Yes[h]	Yes
15. Special Impact (Kennedy-Javits)	LABOR-BWP[c]	V, O, W	Yes	Unemployed and below poverty level in urban poverty areas.	4,000[j]	N.A.	(64,400 slots included in above figure)	No	Yes

Table II (continued)

Program Characteristics: Training Programs Administered by the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity

Program	Administering Federal Agency	Offerings[a]	Trainee Allowances	Target Population	Program Activities, Fiscal 1967		Fiscal 1968 (Program Goals) Number of Slots	Stipulated State Allotment Formula	Matching Required
					Number of Enrollees	Number of Completions			
16. Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers Program	OEO-CAP-SP-Migrant Division	P, B, and O	Yes, for some trainees.	Migrant and seasonal farm workers and their families. Only heads of families, usually male, eligible for allowances.	28,000	N.A.	28,000	No	No
17. Manpower Components of Community Action Programs	OEO-CAP	P, V and O	No, not usually.	People below poverty level.	198,800[k]	D.N.A.	319,800[l]	No	Yes
18. Adult Basic Education in Community Action Programs	OEO-CAP	B and O	No	Over 18, below poverty level, and with low education.	50,000 (estimated)	N.A.	70,000 enrollees	No	Yes
19. Indian Training Programs	OEO-CAP-SP-Indian Division	P, V, B and O	Yes, for some trainees.	Indians over 16 on Federal reservations, unemployed, poor, or educationally disadvantaged.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	No	No
20. Research and Demonstration (R and D)in Community Action	OEO	P, B, V, O may be included for research purposes.	Depends on type of study.	People below poverty level.	D.N.A.	D.N.A.	D.N.A. Goals are research, not training.	No	No
21. Job Corps	OEO-Job Corps	B, P, V, W and O	Yes	Disadvantaged[m] youth 16-21.	41,883[n]	N.A.	39,000 slots for 117,000 enrollees.	No	No

Table II (continued)

Program Characteristics: Training Programs Administered by the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity

Program	Administering Federal Agency	Offerings[a]	Trainee Allowances	Target Population	Program Activities, Fiscal 1967 Number of Enrollees	Program Activities, Fiscal 1967 Number of Completions	Fiscal 1968 (Program Goals) Number of Slots	Stipulated State Allotment Formula	Matching Required
22. Adult Basic Education	HEW-OE-ABE	B, P, and other	No	By law, all over 18 without high school diplomas are eligible. Actual emphasis on below 8th grade, with priority to those below 5th grade. Unemployed, heads of families, and welfare recipients are also designated as special targets.	400,000 (estimated)	38,000 (estimated)	345,900 enrollees plus 52,500 R & D.	Yes	Yes
23. Vocational Education	HEW-OE-BAVLP	V* also P & B now	No	Anyone who can benefit from voc. ed.	N.A.	N.A.	7,000,000	Yes	Yes
24. Work-Study Program	HEW-OE-BAVLP	W	Yes (in form of subsidized wages).	In-school youth enrolled in vocational education.	N.A.	N.A.	None[c]	Yes	Yes
25. Vocational Rehabilitation	HEW-SRS-RSA	B, P, V, O*	In some cases.	Handicapped	139,000 received training.	N.A	185,000 to receive training.	Yes	Yes
26. Vocational Rehabilitation-Disability Beneficiaries	HEW-SRS-RSA; HEW-SSA	B, P, V, O*	No (receive Soc. Sec. disability allowances).	Recipients of Soc. Sec. disability benefits	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	No	No
27. Work Experience and Training (Welfare Recipients)	HEW-SRS-APA; HEW-OE-DMDT. LABOR-BES; LABOR-BWP; LABOR-BAT[c]	W*, B, P, V, O	Trainees receive public assistance or equivalent amounts plus Training related expenses.	Welfare recipients and others eligible to receive public assistance.	128,393 in 95,400 slots.	29,975	54,500 trainees in 30,230 slots.	No	No

Table II (continued)

Program Characteristics: Training Programs Administered by the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity

Program	Administering Federal Agency	Offerings[a]	Trainee Allowances	Target Population	Program Activities, Fiscal 1967 Number of Enrollees	Program Activities, Fiscal 1967 Number of Completions	Fiscal 1968 Program Goals Number of Slots	Stipulated State Allotment Formula	Matching Required
28. Community Work and Training[p]	HEW-SRS-APA	W*, B, P, V, O	No (public assistance recipients). Receive supplements for training-related expenses	Parents receiving AFDC-UP.	13,600[q]	D. N. A.	N. A.	No	Yes

---

[a] B = Basic Education; P = Prevocational Education; V = Vocational Training; W = Work Experience; O = Other services, variously supportive; * Indicates primary offering, if any.

[b] Estimated distribution of actual Institutional and OJT enrollments and completions.

[c] Reorganizations of October 23 and December 20, 1967, in the Manpower Administration have made the following changes: 1) the Bureau of Work Programs (BWP) has been redesignated the Bureau of Work-Training Programs (BWTP); 2) the BAT's responsibilities in MDTA, EOA, and Social Security Act programs have been transferred to the BWTP; 3) OMPER has been dissolved and its functions absorbed directly into the office of the Manpower Administrator.

[d] D.N.A. = Does Not Apply.

[e] N.A. means information not available.

[f] Program was actually begun in June 1967. There were very few, if any, enrollees between that time and the end of Fiscal 1967.

[g] The 1967 EOA Amendments provide an NYC program for high school youth only; out-of-school youth would be included in the new Comprehensive Work and Training Program.

[h] Becomes part of the Comprehensive Work and Training Program established by the 1967 EOA Amendments. Under the new provisions, the Director of OEO may establish the criteria for distribution among the States, taking into consideration such factors as population, unemployment, and family income levels.

[i] Part of the new Comprehensive Work and Training Program; this will be opened to out-of-school youth.

[j] These figures represent enrollment opportunities.

[k] Includes 110,000 referred to other programs or employment, 80,000 receiving direct or supportive services, and 8,800 enrolled as trainees in OIC programs with CAP funds.

[l] Includes 172,000 to be referred, 135,000 to receive direct or supportive services, and 12,800 to be trained in Opportunities Industrialization Centers.

[m] Under the 1967 EOA Amendments, the age range is 14 through 21 years.

[n] Number of enrollees on board at end of year, June 30, 1967.

[o] It was expected that this program would be discontinued in fiscal 1968. However, some funds have now been set aside for the program.

[p] The 1967 amendments have made considerable changes in this program, to take effect July 1, 1969.

[q] Average monthly number of participants during period from July 1966-May 1967.

Activities of Committee

In early 1967, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare named fourteen persons from outside the Federal government to constitute a committee to study the administration of Federally supported training programs, as directed by the 89th Congress in the conference report on Public Law 89-787.

Some of the members of the Committee, to be known as the Committee on Administration of Training Programs (CATP), had an intimate understanding of the operations of certain on-going manpower programs; others were familiar with the institutions which service these programs; others possessed a broad knowledge of the overall program purposes and relationships. With these diverse backgrounds and experiences, the Committee possessed broad perspectives from which it could evaluate the opinions, documents, and events with which it was confronted.

The first meeting of the CATP was on April 7, 1967. Subsequently, monthly meetings were held through January 1968. To facilitate the receiving of testimony and to offer opportunity for site visits, meetings were held in New Haven, Oakland, New York City, Chicago, and New Orleans, in addition to Washington, D. C. With the exception of two meetings, all sessions included invited experts who presented their views and were questioned by the Committee. In several cities, special on-site inspections were made to witness first-hand the training procedures and facilities. As a result, the Committee had the opportunity to meet directly with administrators, sponsors, instructors, and trainees as well as with educators, politicians, civil rights leaders, neighborhood spokesmen, university authorities, labor, and business representatives.

To expedite the collection of the detailed information needed to assess operations of present programs, the Committee appointed Dr. Vernon M. Briggs, Jr. (from the Department of Economics at the University of Texas). It also awarded a contract through competitive bidding procedures to Greenleigh Associates, Inc., of New York City, a research and consulting organization specializing in problems in the human resources and urban development fields. The final report to the Committee by its contractor, entitled Opening the Doors: Job Training Programs, is available as a separate document.

Interviews were conducted with numerous individuals within the federal, state, and local administering agencies. For each of the nearly thirty programs, the statutory objective, client coverage, training and services requirements, funding methods, and evaluation procedure were determined. Program operations were traced through regional, state, and local administrative steps. At each level, the lateral coordination among programs was evaluated. A tabulation of pertinent characteristics of each of the programs is shown in Appendixes.

Because these programs are in operation in every State and in most large cities, only a very few of the local operations could be examined in depth. Rather than cursorily surveying activities in a number of States and cities, it was decided to select two States and two communities in each of these States for intensive review. California and Missouri were chosen as the States; Oakland, Fresno, St. Louis and Springfield as the cities.

The factors that were weighed in making the State selections were as follows:

California:

Aside from being the most populous State, it is the Nation's largest agricultural State and one of its leading industrial States. It contains a blend of both urban and rural problems to which a variety of remedial training programs have been addressed. In addition to its industrial characteristics, the State's population demography is similarly diverse. The post-World War II years have witnessed an influx of Negroes migrating from the rural southeastern States who have joined the Spanish-speaking Americans already in the State, to swell the ranks of the State's disadvantaged citizens. Three of the eight major labor market areas in the United States in 1966 which had unemployment rates that were twice the national average were in the State.

Missouri:

In contrast with California, Missouri has gained less prominence in its efforts to administer programs to meet the changing needs of its work force. With almost all of the programs in operation, the State has had a variety of problems to solve. Especially severe has been the heavy in-migration of Negroes from the South who have been added to the State's long-time disadvantaged Ozark Plateau population.

In each State two cities were chosen for study, one large, one small.

As a further information resource, opinions on the programs were requested of the Governors of the fifty States and the Mayors of cities with a population of over 25,000. The Committee sought general impressions, constructive criticisms, and recommendations for improvements.

Throughout the course of the study, the members of the Committee were kept abreast of recent reports, pending legislation, relevant documents, and related studies. Interviews were conducted by its staff with administrators, instructors, trainees, and community organization officials in various localities. In addition, seminar discussions were held with academic authorities at the University of Michigan and the University of Wisconsin.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Bureau of the Budget each assigned a liaison person to the Committee. These representatives attended and participated in the Committee's sessions. They were instrumental in providing the response of their respective agencies to the needs of the Committee.

List of Witnesses and Other Persons
Who Attended Committee Meetings

Curtis Aller, Director of the Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.; Bernard Aufferman, Official, Project S.T.A.R., Jackson, Mississippi; Melvin Barlow, Staff Director, Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D. C.; Carlson A. Bobino, East Bay On-the-Job Training Project, Urban League; Oakland, California; Fred Castro, Spanish Speaking Unity Council, Oakland, California; Joseph Colmen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Fred Davis, East Bay On-the-Job Training Project, Urban League, Oakland, California; Robert M. Davis, East Bay On-the-Job Training Project, Urban League, Oakland, California; Paul Degedin, Department of Human Resources, City of Oakland, Oakland, California; James Del Gadillo, Spanish Speaking Unity Council, Oakland, California; Walter Dullea, Regional Representative of the Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; John W. Dunn, Superintendent, Peralta Junior College, Oakland, California.

Joseph Fitzgerald, Representative of State Office of Vocational Education, New Haven, Connecticut; Dorothy Fogarty, Director of Title V Programs for New Haven, New Haven, Connecticut; John K. Ford, Representative of the Office of the Lieutenant Governor's Office, State of California, Oakland, California; John W. Gardner, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; Eli Ginzberg, Chairman, National Manpower Advisory Committee and Director, Institute for the Conservation of Human Resources, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Ernest Green, Director, Apprenticeship Program of the Workers Defense League, New York, New York; Charles Hall, New Haven Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Connecticut; Nicholas J. Hondrogen, Regional Representative of the Office of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; Harry Hyman, Representative of the State Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, New Haven, Connecticut; Josephine M. Jiminez, Spanish Speaking Unity Council, Oakland, California; Clarence Jones, Director, Opportunities Industrialization Center, Oakland, California.

Clarence Jupiter, Director, Concentrated Employment Program, New Orleans, Louisiana; Robert A. Levine, Assistant Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C.; Frank Logue, Director of Community Progress, Inc., Training Institute, New Haven, Connecticut; Joseph Marci, Manpower Coordinator, Community Progress Inc., New Haven, Connecticut; Neil McArthur, Special Assistant to the Manpower Administrator, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.; Father McManus, President, New Orleans Urban League, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Jack Mickie, Director, East Bay Skills Center, Oakland, California; Paul Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; Charles Odell, Director, United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.; James G. O'Hara, U. S. Representative from Michigan; Joseph Purcell, Director, New Haven Office of the Connecticut State Employment Service, New Haven, Connecticut; Fred Ricci, Representative of the Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Thayne Robson, Executive Director of the President's Committee on Manpower, Washington, D. C.; Don H. Roney, Representative of the Manpower Administrator, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.; Harry Rosenberg, Associate City Manager, City of Oakland, Oakland, California; Minick Sharkiewiez, Coordinator, State Department of Welfare, New Haven, Connecticut; Harold Sheppard, Staff of the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Washington, D. C.; Jerry Siefkin, Institute of Human Relations, Loyola University, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Lawrence Spitz, Executive Director, Community Progress, Inc., New Haven, Connecticut; Byrn Stafford, Representative of Urban Renewal Agency, New Haven, Connecticut; Mitchel Sviridoff, Administrator, Human Resources Administration, City of New York, New York, New York; Hugh Taylor, Executive Director, Manpower Commission, City of Oakland, Oakland, California; Vincent Tesunaitis, Representative of State Department of Welfare, New Haven, Connecticut; Edward Tibald, Representative of Bureau of Social Services, State Department of Welfare, New Haven, Connecticut.

Andrew Truelson, Chief, Assistance Payments Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; Grant Venn, Associate Commissioner for Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.; Gertrude M. Williams, North Oakland Adult Projects, Neighborhood Services Center, Oakland, California; Walter Williams, Representative of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C.

Lionel Wilson, Chairman, Oakland Economic Development Council, Oakland, California; W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.; Elizabeth Wright, Supervisor of Curriculum, New Haven Public Schools, New Haven, Connecticut; James Yaueamoto, Representative of Marshall Kaplan and Associates, Oakland, California; Thomas Yoczik, State Manpower Coordinator, New Haven, Connecticut; Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League, New York, New York.

List of Committee, Subcommittee, and Staff Site Visits and Special Activities

Ann Arbor, Michigan:

Seminar with Dr. William Haber, University of Michigan; Dr. Dan Kruger, Michigan State University; Joseph Tuma, Wayne State University, and others.

Madison, Wisconsin:

Seminar with Dr. Gerald Somers and associates, University of Wisconsin.

New Haven, Connecticut:

Interviews with officials and trainees of Community Progress, Inc., manpower programs (Neighborhood Youth Corp, Adult Work Training, Skill Center); Interviews with officers and members of Hill Parents Association.

Battle Creek, Michigan:

Tour of Custer Job Corps Center.

Detroit, Michigan:

Interviews with officials of Detroit Urban Youth Program and Detroit Career Development Center, Inc.

Oakland, California:

Tours of Parks Job Corps Center, East Bay Skills Center, Opportunities Industrialization Center, and North Oakland Neighborhood Services Center.